



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

2013-2014 ARCHIVE

Source of Funds Report

SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT
313 Hwy 62 E, Salem, AR 72576

Source of Funds Report

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Total Amount Reported: \$252830.76

Generated on September 16, 2014

SALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$84730

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$11095

Priority 1: Literacy

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$41750

Priority 1: Literacy

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$31885

Priority 1: Literacy

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services".

SALEM HIGH SCHOOL -- \$82343

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$9093

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.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$39000

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.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$31750

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.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$2500

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.

SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$85757.76

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$16617.76

Priority 2: Safe and Drug Free Environment

Goal: To reduce the percentage of Salem students using tobacco products (in all forms) and alcohol; to make students aware of choices that they have regarding any drug usage.

Priority 4: State Support

Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$58065

Priority 2: Safe and Drug Free Environment

Goal: To reduce the percentage of Salem students using tobacco products (in all forms) and alcohol; to make students aware of choices that they have regarding any drug usage.

Priority 4: State Support

Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$9855

Priority 4: State Support

Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$1220

Priority 4: State Support

Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.

SALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$84730

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$11095

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 2013 DATA INDICATES THAT SALEM STUDENTS SCORED LOWER IN THE PRACTICAL AND LITERARY 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. 2013 RESULTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR EQUAL EMPHASIS ON THE CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS OF WRITING. TEACHERS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE CONTENT AND STYLE DURING WRITING INSTRUCTION. 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. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 88% of the economically disadvantaged students, 55% of the students with

2. 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. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 43% of the students with disabilities, and 92% 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. In 2013, 89% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 84% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% of the students with disabilities, and 87% 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 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. In 2012, 93% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 89% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 93% 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 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. In 2013, 96% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 93% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 95% 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 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.

3/36

4. 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. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 93% of the economically disadvantaged students, 28% of the students with disabilities, and 91% 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-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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2013, 93% 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, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 92% 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-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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.
5. 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%. In 2012, Kindergarten did not test. In 2013, Kindergarten did not test.
6. 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. In 2012, 75.9% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.1% of the Caucasian students, 68.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% 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 2013, 77.8% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 76.2% of the Caucasian students, 69.4% of the free/reduced students, and 0% 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 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. In 2012, 78.2% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 75.5% of the Caucasian students, 70.3% 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 2013, 79.4% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.5% of the Caucasian students, 71.3% 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. The 2011 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2011 School Improvement Report. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2012 School Improvement Report. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2013 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 AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 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 2009-2012 Combined Population: African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: Econ. Dis.: LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

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
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) Andrea Walling will be paid with Title II-A and 1 teacher's salary, David Cone, at 1 FTE will be paid with NSLA funds in 2013-2014. 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 15.95 to 1. If the funds were not used, the ratio would have been 17.55 to 1. Action Type: Equity	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$11,095.00 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$11,095.00
Total Budget:				\$11,095.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$41750

Priority 1: Literacy

- 2013 DATA INDICATES THAT SALEM STUDENTS SCORED LOWER IN THE PRACTICAL AND LITERARY 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. 2013 RESULTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR EQUAL EMPHASIS ON THE CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS OF WRITING. TEACHERS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE CONTENT AND STYLE DURING WRITING INSTRUCTION. 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. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 88% of the economically disadvantaged students, 55% 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-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2013, 92% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 90% of the economically disadvantaged students, 29% 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-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains.
- In 2011, 82% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on

Supporting Data:

- 6/36

disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2013, 93% 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, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 92% 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-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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

5. 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%. In 2012, Kindergarten did not test. In 2013, Kindergarten did not test.
6. 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. In 2012, 75.9% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.1% of the Caucasian students, 68.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% 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 2013, 77.8% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 76.2% of the Caucasian students, 69.4% of the free/reduced students, and 0% 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 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. In 2012, 78.2% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 75.5% of the Caucasian students, 70.3% 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 2013, 79.4% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.5% of the Caucasian students, 71.3% 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. The 2011 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2011 School Improvement Report. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2012 School Improvement Report. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2013 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 AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 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 2009-2012 Combined Population: African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: Econ. Dis.: LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

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
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) Andrea Walling will be paid with Title II-A and 1 teacher's salary, David Cone, at 1 FTE will be paid with NSLA funds in 2013-2014. Efforts will be made to make sure that classes are equitable when being divided into groups	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$41,750.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$41,750.00

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 15.95 to 1. If the funds were not used, the ratio would have been 17.55 to 1. Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$41,750.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$31885

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 2013 DATA INDICATES THAT SALEM STUDENTS SCORED LOWER IN THE PRACTICAL AND LITERARY 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. 2013 RESULTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR EQUAL EMPHASIS ON THE CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS OF WRITING. TEACHERS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE CONTENT AND STYLE DURING WRITING INSTRUCTION. 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. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 88% of the economically disadvantaged students, 55% 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-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2013, 92% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 90% of the economically disadvantaged students, 29% 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-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains.
2. 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. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 43% of the students with disabilities, and 92% 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. In 2013, 89% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 84% of the

economically disadvantaged students, 50% of the students with disabilities, and 87% 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.

Supporting
Data:

3. 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. In 2012, 93% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 89% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 93% 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 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. In 2013, 96% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 93% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 95% 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 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 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. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 93% of the economically disadvantaged students, 28% of the students with disabilities, and 91% 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-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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2013, 93% 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, 0% of the students with disabilities, and 92% 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-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-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.
5. 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%. In 2012, Kindergarten did not test. In 2013, Kindergarten did not test.
6. 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. In 2012, 75.9% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.1% of the Caucasian students, 68.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% 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 2013, 77.8% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 76.2% of the Caucasian students, 69.4% of the free/reduced students, and 0% 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 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. In 2012, 78.2% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 75.5% of the Caucasian students, 70.3% 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 2013, 79.4% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.5% of the Caucasian students, 71.3% 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. The 2011 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2011 School Improvement Report. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2012 School Improvement Report. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2013 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 AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 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 2009-2012 Combined Population: African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: Econ. Dis.: LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

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
Technology supplies will be purchased to support all instructional programs. Printer supplies, such as drums and toner to repair existing printers and projector bulbs for existing projectors. Supplies for any repairs to laptops. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$6,500.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$6,500.00
Balt Charging carts at \$995.00 will be purchased to charge the Samsung and Acer Chromebooks that will be used in classroom.	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$21,750.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$21,750.00
Total Budget:				\$28,250.00
Intervention: Interactive Whiteboards will be 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
Projectors and printers will be purchased to keep the integrity of the interactive whiteboards for every classroom. The projectors are in their fourth year of service and will need to be cared for as needed.	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers Teaching Aids 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$3,635.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$3,635.00
Total Budget:				\$3,635.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services".

SALEM HIGH SCHOOL -- \$82343

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$9093

Priority 1: Literacy

1. In 2013, 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 2013, 72% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 66% 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 2013 81% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 81% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 29% 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 2013, 89% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 88% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 33% 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 2013, 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 2013, 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 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.
4. 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.
5. Students have scored an average of 18.9 on the ACT exam in English and a 20 in reading during the 2011, 2012, and 2013 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report list the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.
- 7.

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.

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

Intervention: Reduce class size in English.				
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
The grade level placement of CSR (classroom size reduction) teacher will be based upon enrollment at the beginning of the school year. Teachers input and data from several sources will be used to divide the students up into equitable classes. In the seventh grade, one period of English is above the required sections (April Tyree from 20 to 15) FTE =0.1429. In the eighth grade, one period of English is above the required amount of sections (Rachael Foster from 23 to 17) FTE = 0.1429. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$2,810.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,810.00
Total Budget:				\$2,810.00

Intervention: The district will hire Kim Smith-Harber as an interventionist.				
Scientific Based Research: Response to Intervention: A Research Review http://www.rtinetwork.org/learn/research/researchreview				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Kim Smith-Harber will be hired to serve as an interventionists (3) periods per day. FTE = 0.1905	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$2,618.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,618.00
Total Budget:				\$2,618.00

Priority 2: Math

1. In 2013, 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 2013, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 43% 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 2013, 72% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 68% 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 2013, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 76% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 25% 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 2013, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 79% 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 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 2013, 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 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 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

Supporting
Data:

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.

4. 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 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.

5. Students have scored an average of 20 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2011, 2012, and 2013 school years.
6. The 2013 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: 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
COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Title I and Class size reduction will be used to reduce the size of Math classes. Class size in 8th Math (Moore) will be reduced from 23 to 17.25 students per class. We have added two additional sections in the 8th grade. We will pay 0.1429 FTE with this money. Action Type: Collaboration	Wayne Guiltner	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office Title Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$1,500.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1,500.00
Total Budget:				\$1,500.00
Intervention: To improve mathematics curriculum by teaching all Smart Core math classes as a fourth year math including Algebra III, Advanced Topics and Modeling in Mathematics, 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
An ACT Prep class will be offered to students in an effort to help students prepare for the ACT.	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$2,165.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,165.00
Total Budget:				\$2,165.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$39000**Priority 1: Literacy**

1. In 2013, 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 2013, 72% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 66% 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 2013 81% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 81% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 29% 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 2013, 89% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 88% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 33% 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 2013, 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 2013, 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.
3. 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:

4. 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.
5. Students have scored an average of 18.9 on the ACT exam in English and a 20 in reading during the 2011, 2012, and 2013 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report list the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.
- 7.

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.

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

Intervention: Reduce class size in English.				
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
The grade level placement of CSR (classroom size reduction) teacher will be based upon enrollment at the beginning of the school year. Teachers input and data from several sources will be used to divide the students up into equitable classes. In the seventh grade, one period of English is above the required sections (April Tyree from 20 to 15) FTE =0.1429. In the eighth grade, one period of English is above the required amount of sections (Rachael Foster from 23 to 17) FTE = 0.1429. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$12,471.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$12,471.00
Total Budget:				\$12,471.00
Intervention: The district will hire Kim Smith-Harber as an interventionist.				
Scientific Based Research: Response to Intervention: A Research Review				

http://www.rtinetwork.org/learn/research/researchreview				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Kim Smith-Harber will be hired to serve as an interventionists (3) periods per day. FTE = 0.1905	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$9,850.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$9,850.00
Total Budget:				\$9,850.00

Priority 2: Math

1. In 2013, 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 2013, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 43% 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 2013, 72% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 68% 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 2013, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 76% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 25% 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 2013, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 79% 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 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 2013, 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 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,

Supporting
Data:

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.

4. 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 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.
5. Students have scored an average of 20 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2011, 2012, and 2013 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items.

Goal Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.

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

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
COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Title I and Class size reduction will be used to reduce the size of Math classes. Class size in 8th Math (Moore) will be reduced from 23 to 17.25 students per class. We have added two additional sections in the 8th grade. We will pay 0.1429 FTE with this money. Action Type: Collaboration	Wayne Guiltner	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office Title Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$6,679.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,679.00
Total Budget:				\$6,679.00

Intervention: To improve mathematics curriculum by teaching all Smart Core math classes as a fourth year math including Algebra III, Advanced Topics and Modeling in Mathematics, 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
An ACT Prep class will be offered to students in an effort to help students prepare for the ACT.	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$10,000.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$10,000.00
Total Budget:				\$10,000.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$31750

Priority 1: Literacy

1. In 2013, 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 2013, 72% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 66% 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 2013 81% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 81% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 29% 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 2013, 89% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 88% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 33% 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 2013, the combined population of seventh grade

Supporting
Data:

- 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 2013, 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.
3. 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.
 4. 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.

5. Students have scored an average of 18.9 on the ACT exam in English and a 20 in reading during the 2011, 2012, and 2013 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report list the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.
- 7.

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.

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

Intervention: Continue To Use Accelerated Reader Program				
Scientific Based Research: Renaissance Learning, Inc., March 2002, Summary of Research. p. 1-56.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Technology supplies will be purchased along with toner to support educational programs within the high school. Printer and projector parts will also be purchased as well as computer components. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Shaun Windsor, Technology Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$6,660.00 & Supplies: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,660.00
Total Budget:				\$6,660.00
Intervention: Technology will be purchased to improve educational opportunities in the classroom.				
Scientific Based Research: http://www.teachertime123.com/2011/02/the-value-of-technology-in-the-classroom-article/ The Value of Technology in the Classroom. February 26, 2011.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS: 6 Printers and 1 projector will be purchased for classrooms. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 10/01/2013 End: 05/31/2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$1,340.00 & Supplies: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1,340.00
The district will purchase web cams and head phones for distance learning opportunities in the classroom. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor, Technology Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$1,300.00 & Supplies: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1,300.00
The district will purchase 264 chrome books (at \$420.48) to help with the implementation of a one to one initiative for students. (47 purchased with NSLA money at \$19875 and 195 purchased with Title I money at \$82150.50 and 22 chrome books will be purchased with Title VI money at \$9375. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor, Technology Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Computers Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$19,875.00 & Supplies: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$19,875.00

Total Budget:	\$22,515.00
Priority 2: Math	

1. In 2013, 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 2013, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 43% 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 2013, 72% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 68% 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 2013, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 76% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 25% 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 2013, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 79% 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 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 2013, 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 2012, 76% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th

Supporting
Data:

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 for 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.

4. 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 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.

5. Students have scored an average of 20 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2011, 2012, and 2013 school years.
6. The 2013 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
Additional calculators will be purchased to replace broken calculators. 20 TI-84 calculators will be purchased. Students may check out the calculators and bring them	Wayne Guiltner	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$2,575.00

home to help complete homework.				& Supplies:
Action Type: AIP/IRI				
Action Type: Alignment				
Action Type: Collaboration				
Action Type: Equity				ACTION BUDGET: \$2,575.00
Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Total Budget:				\$2,575.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$2500

Priority 2: Math

1. In 2013, 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 2013, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 43% 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 2013, 72% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 68% 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 2013, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 76% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 25% 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 2013, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 79% 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 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 2013, 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 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

Supporting
Data:

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.

4. 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 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.
5. Students have scored an average of 20 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2011, 2012, and 2013 school years.
6. The 2013 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: To improve mathematics curriculum by teaching all Smart Core math classes as a fourth year math including Algebra III, Advanced Topics and Modeling in Mathematics, 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
Salem schools will purchase one ACT exam through the VUAA for each junior. Students will take the exam in March through April. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$2,500.00 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$2,500.00
Total Budget:				\$2,500.00

SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$85757.76

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$16617.76

Priority 2: Safe and Drug Free Environment

Supporting Data:

1. According to 2012-13 APNA Survey, 18.4% of 6th graders, 41.7% of 8th graders, 37.5% of 10th graders, and 51.4% of 12th graders had used cigarettes in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 9.7% of 6th graders, 16.3% of 8th graders, 40.4% of 10th graders, and 40.5% of 12th graders had used cigarettes in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 12% of 6th graders, 25.7% of 8th graders, and 33.3% of 10th graders, and 30.8% of 12th graders had used cigarettes in their lifetimes.
2. According to 2012-13 data, 16.3% of the 6th graders, 18.8% of the 8th graders, 25% of the 10th graders, and 45.7% of the 12th graders had used chewing tobacco in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 3.2% of 6th graders, 23.3% of the 8th graders, 34% of the 10th graders, and 31% of the 12th graders had used chewing tobacco in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 10% of the 6th graders, 14.3% of the 8th graders, 33.3% of the 8th graders, and 42.3% of the 10th graders had used chewing tobacco in their lifetimes.
3. According to 2012-13 data, 28.6% of the 6th grade students, 40.4% of the 8th graders, 55% of the 10th graders, and 79.4% of the 12th graders had used alcohol in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 9.7% of 6th graders, 23.8% of the 8th graders, 64.4% of the 10th graders, and 52.4% of the 12th graders had used alcohol in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 16.3% of the 6th graders, 40% of the 8th graders, and 54.8% of the 10th graders, and 57.7% of 12th graders had used alcohol in their lifetimes.
4. According to 2012-13 data, 12.2% of 6th graders, 12.5% of the 8th graders, 17.5% of the 10th graders, and 47.1% of the 12th graders had used marijuana in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 0% of 6th graders, 4.8% of the 8th graders, 24.4% of the 10th graders, and 29.3% of the 12th graders had used marijuana in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 0% of the 6th graders, 5.7% of the 8th graders, and 21.4% of the 10th graders, and 15.4% of 12th graders had used marijuana in their lifetimes.

Goal To reduce the percentage of Salem students using tobacco products (in all forms) and alcohol; to make students aware of choices that they have regarding any drug usage.

Benchmark There will be a 1.0% decrease in the number of students suspended for drug, alcohol, or tobacco use in the Salem School District.

Intervention: Employ a School Resource Officer				
Scientific Based Research: To Protect and Educate: The School Resource Officer and the Prevention of Violence in Schools; The National Association of School Resource Officers 2012				
Actions	Person	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

	Responsible			
The Salem School District will employ a full-time Resource Officer. Daniel Busch (1.0 FTE) will be employed for this position. Salary 30,000.00 Benefits 8,407.00. The Resource Officer will provide school security for students, teachers, and staff during the school day. Mr. Busch will provide for security at extra-curricular activities. In addition, he will visit classrooms and provide training for students on various safety issues: ex. dangers of drugs/alcohol, bullying, bus safety, campus safety. He will also provide professional development for school staff on school safety. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	NSLA (State-281) - \$8,407.00 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$8,407.00
Total Budget:				\$8,407.00

Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data:	1. 1.Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2013-14 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students 4. Using technology in the classroom.
	2. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2012-13 school-year. 3. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.
Goal	To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.
Benchmark	To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2013- 14, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.

Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding				
Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999). Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Funds will be used as an incentive to increase salaries above the minimum salary schedule. The Salem School District has used NSLA funds in this manner since the inception of NSLA funding. The district is in compliance with state law that requires a yearly 20% reduction in funds used for salaries above the minimum until no more than 20% of NSLA funds are used for this expenditure. The district has received approval from the commissioner of education to use funds in this manner as required by law. The Salem School District uses funds to increase salary above the minimum to ensure that we can attract highly qualified teachers to teach in our district. A quality teacher in the classroom is the most important commodity the district can purchase to ensure student success. Teachers that receive salary above the minimum through NSLA are: Cori Long, Kara Boyd, Tiffany Cooper, Devon Edwards,	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office 	NSLA (State-281) - \$8,210.76 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$8,210.76

Denise Fowler, Rachel Gaskins, Miranda Hurtt.				
Total Budget:				\$8,210.76

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$58065

Priority 2: Safe and Drug Free Environment

Supporting Data:

1. According to 2012-13 APNA Survey, 18.4% of 6th graders, 41.7% of 8th graders, 37.5% of 10th graders, and 51.4% of 12th graders had used cigarettes in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 9.7% of 6th graders, 16.3% of 8th graders, 40.4% of 10th graders, and 40.5% of 12th graders had used cigarettes in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 12% of 6th graders, 25.7% of 8th graders, and 33.3% of 10th graders, and 30.8% of 12th graders had used cigarettes in their lifetimes.
2. According to 2012-13 data, 16.3% of the 6th graders, 18.8% of the 8th graders, 25% of the 10th graders, and 45.7% of the 12th graders had used chewing tobacco in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 3.2% of 6th graders, 23.3% of the 8th graders, 34% of the 10th graders, and 31% of the 12th graders had used chewing tobacco in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 10% of the 6th graders, 14.3% of the 8th graders, 33.3% of the 8th graders, and 42.3% of the 10th graders had used chewing tobacco in their lifetimes.
3. According to 2012-13 data, 28.6% of the 6th grade students, 40.4% of the 8th graders, 55% of the 10th graders, and 79.4% of the 12th graders had used alcohol in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 9.7% of 6th graders, 23.8% of the 8th graders, 64.4% of the 10th graders, and 52.4% of the 12th graders had used alcohol in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 16.3% of the 6th graders, 40% of the 8th graders, and 54.8% of the 10th graders, and 57.7% of 12th graders had used alcohol in their lifetimes.
4. According to 2012-13 data, 12.2% of 6th graders, 12.5% of the 8th graders, 17.5% of the 10th graders, and 47.1% of the 12th graders had used marijuana in their lifetimes. According to 2011-12 data, 0% of 6th graders, 4.8% of the 8th graders, 24.4% of the 10th graders, and 29.3% of the 12th graders had used marijuana in their lifetimes. According to 2010-11 data, 0% of the 6th graders, 5.7% of the 8th graders, and 21.4% of the 10th graders, and 15.4% of 12th graders had used marijuana in their lifetimes.

Goal	To reduce the percentage of Salem students using tobacco products (in all forms) and alcohol; to make students aware of choices that they have regarding any drug usage.
------	--

Benchmark There will be a 1.0% decrease in the number of students suspended for drug, alcohol, or tobacco use in the Salem School District.

Intervention: Employ a School Resource Officer				
Scientific Based Research: To Protect and Educate: The School Resource Officer and the Prevention of Violence in Schools; The National Association of School Resource Officers 2012				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The Salem School District will employ a full-time Resource Officer. Daniel Busch (1.0 FTE) will be employed for this position. Salary 30,000.00 Benefits 8,407.00. The Resource Officer will provide school security for students, teachers, and staff during the school day. Mr. Busch will provide for security at extra-curricular activities. In addition, he will visit classrooms and provide training for students on various safety issues: ex. dangers of drugs/alcohol, bullying, bus safety, campus safety. He will also provide professional development for school staff on school safety. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	NSLA (State-281) - \$30,000.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$30,000.00
Total Budget:			\$30,000.00	

Priority 4: State Support

1. Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2013-14 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high

Supporting Data:	<p>order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students 4. Using technology in the classroom.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2012-13 school-year. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. <p>The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.</p>
Goal	<p>To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.</p> <p>To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2013- 14, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will</p>
Benchmark	<p>also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.</p>

Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding				
Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999). Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Funds will be used as an incentive to increase salaries above the minimum salary schedule. The Salem School District has used NSLA funds in this manner since the inception of NSLA funding. The district is in compliance with state law that requires a yearly 20% reduction in funds used for salaries above the minimum until no more than 20% of NSLA funds are used for this expenditure. The district has received approval from the commissioner of education to use funds in this manner as required by law. The Salem School District uses funds to increase salary above the minimum to ensure that we can attract highly qualified teachers to teach in our district. A quality teacher in the classroom is the most important commodity the district can purchase to ensure student success. Teachers that receive salary above the minimum through NSLA are: Cori Long, Kara Boyd, Tiffany Cooper, Devon Edwards, Denise Fowler, Rachel Gaskins, Miranda Hurtt.	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office 	NSLA (State-281) - \$28,065.00 Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$28,065.00
Total Budget:				\$28,065.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$9855

Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2013-14 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students 4. Using technology in the classroom. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2012-13 school-year. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. <p>The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.</p>
Goal	<p>To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.</p> <p>To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources</p>

Benchmark and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2013- 14, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.

Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding				
Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999). Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Technology materials, supplies, and software will be purchased to support instructional programs and the operation of the district local area network. The district will purchase and/or replace technology supplies necessary to deliver the technology. The purchase of these items will ensure the delivery of technology learning/practice programs from the stored location to the student. In addition, the district will purchase technology devices and evaluate the product for use in the classroom by students to increase technology inclusion and student achievement. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$9,855.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$9,855.00
Total Budget:				\$9,855.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$1220

Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data: 1. 1.Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2013-14 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students 4. Using technology in the classroom.
2. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2012-13 school-year.
3. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.

Goal To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.
To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2013- 14, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.

Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding				
Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999). Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Technology materials, supplies, and software will be purchased to support instructional programs and the operation of the district local area network. The district will purchase and/or replace technology supplies	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2013 End: 06/30/2014		NSLA (State-281) - Purchased \$1,220.00

necessary to deliver the technology. The purchase of these items will ensure the delivery of technology learning/practice programs from the stored location to the student. In addition, the district will purchase technology devices and evaluate the product for use in the classroom by students to increase technology inclusion and student achievement. Action Type: Technology Inclusion				Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$1,220.00
Total Budget:				\$1,220.00