



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: \$235767.24

Generated on April 24, 2015

SALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$117297

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 -- \$23199

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 -- \$85598

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 -- \$5000

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 -- \$3500

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.

SALEM HIGH SCHOOL -- \$53987

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 -- \$7605

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 -- \$30182

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 -- \$5000

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.

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 -- \$11200

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.

SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$64483.24

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$3025

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 Benefits -- \$6751.24

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.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$30960

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.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$22597

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 -- \$1150

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 -- \$117297

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 -- \$23199

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 2014 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. 2014 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 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

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. In 2014, 94% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 92% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% 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-Content 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 2012, Kindergarten did not test. In 2013, Kindergarten did not test. In 2014, Kindergarten did not test.
6. 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. In 2014, 78.6% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.2% of the Caucasian students, 70.4% 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 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. In 2014, 82.4% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 79.5% of the Caucasian students, 79.3% 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 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. The 2014 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. 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 2010-2014 Combined Population: 91.45% African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 93.4% Econ. Dis.: 87.44% 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.				
Actions	Person	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

	Responsible			
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) Kristen Hyslip will be paid with Title II-A and 1 teacher's salary, Treva Cotter, at 1 FTE will be paid with NSLA funds in 2014-2015. 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: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$12,499.00 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$12,499.00
Total Budget:				\$12,499.00
Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding				
Scientific Based Research:				
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: Melodye Aldridge, Kara Boyd, David Cone, Tiffany Cooper, and Devon Edwards.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - \$10,700.00 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$10,700.00
Total Budget:				\$10,700.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$85598

Priority 1: Literacy

- 2014 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. 2014 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 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-

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 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. In 2014, 94% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 92% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% 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-Content 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 2012, Kindergarten did not test. In 2013, Kindergarten did not test. In 2014, Kindergarten did not test.
6. 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. In 2014, 78.6% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.2% of the Caucasian students, 70.4% 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 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. In 2014, 82.4% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 79.5% of the Caucasian students, 79.3% 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 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. The 2014 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. 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 2010-2014

Combined Population: 91.45% African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 93.4% Econ. Dis.: 87.44% 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.				
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) Kristen Hyslip will be paid with Title II-A and 1 teacher's salary, Treva Cotter, at 1 FTE will be paid with NSLA funds in 2014-2015. 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: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$48,750.00 Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$48,750.00
Total Budget:				\$48,750.00
Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding				
Scientific Based Research:				
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: Melodye Aldridge, Kara Boyd, David Cone, Tiffany Cooper, and Devon Edwards.	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - \$36,848.00 Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$36,848.00
Total Budget:				\$36,848.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$5000

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 2014 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. 2014 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 2012, 91% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored

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 2014, 99% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 97% of the economically disadvantaged students, 88% 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 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. In 2014, 94% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 92% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% 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-Content 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 2012, Kindergarten did not test. In 2013, Kindergarten did not test. In 2014, Kindergarten did not test.
6. 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. In 2014, 78.6% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.2% of the Caucasian students, 70.4% 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 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. In 2014, 82.4% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 79.5% of the Caucasian students, 79.3% 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 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. The 2014 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.

To meet the state AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 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 2010-2014 Combined Population: 91.45% African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 93.4% Econ. Dis.: 87.44% LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

Intervention: Accelerated Reader Program.				
Scientific Based Research: 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. Printers will be purchased for elementary classrooms in conjunction with Accelerated Reader program. Printers will be used in every classroom to print AR TOPS reports instead of using the copier in the workroom. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$3,920.00 & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$3,920.00
Total Budget:				\$3,920.00

Intervention: Technology in the classroom.				
Scientific Based Research: Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning; (September 2014) Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education/Alliance for Excellent Education				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Chromecast will be purchased in the elementary classrooms. Chromecast devices will allow teachers and students to project images on the Chromebooks through the projectors such as the online version of the McGraw-Hill reading series. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$1,080.00 & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$1,080.00
Total Budget:				\$1,080.00

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 -- \$3500

Priority 1: Literacy

- 2014 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. 2014 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 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

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 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. In 2014, 94% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 92% of the economically disadvantaged students, 50% 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-Content 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 2012, Kindergarten did not test. In 2013, Kindergarten did not test. In 2014, Kindergarten did not test.
6. 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. In 2014, 78.6% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.2% of the Caucasian students, 70.4% 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 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. In 2014, 82.4% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 79.5% of the Caucasian students, 79.3% 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 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. The 2014 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.

To meet the state AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 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:

Benchmark African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: Econ. Dis.: LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2010-2014
 Combined Population: 91.45% African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 93.4% Econ. Dis.:
 87.44% LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

Intervention: PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT in the elementary school.				
Scientific Based Research: Emma McDonald (2005). Developing Positive Parent Partnerships, 1-4. Diane Debrovner (August, 2004). Parents: Get Set for School, 144-152.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Blackboard Connect will be purchased to inform parents/guardians about school activities, events, and news through the use of mass phone calls. Also, the school will maintain a Facebook page and Twitter account to inform subscribers. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - \$1,000.00 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$1,000.00
Total Budget:				\$1,000.00
Intervention: Technology in the classroom.				
Scientific Based Research: Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning; (September 2014) Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education/Alliance for Excellent Education				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The district will purchase Canvas by Instructure for the grade 5-6 Learning Management Software (LMS). The LMS will be used to incorporate blended learning/digital learning and meet the requirements of Act 1280. Students will complete assignments and be able to submit those assignments to their teachers through the LMS. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - \$2,500.00 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$2,500.00
Total Budget:				\$2,500.00

SALEM HIGH SCHOOL -- \$53987

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 -- \$7605

Priority 1: Literacy

1. In 2014, 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 2014, 78% 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 2014 90% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 85% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 33% 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 2014, 86% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 84% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 56% 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 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.
4. 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

Supporting
Data:

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.

5. Students have scored an average of 18.5 on the ACT exam in English and a 20 in reading during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists 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) 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. The CSR teacher will be providing a section of the course in addition to what is required. In the seventh grade, one period of English is above the required sections (Amanda Himschoot from 20 to 15) FTE =0.2857. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$3,245.00 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$3,245.00
Total Budget:				\$3,245.00
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. The interventionist will be used to supplement instruction and help students succeed in their courses. FTE = 0.1905	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$2,700.00 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$2,700.00
Total Budget:				\$2,700.00

Priority 2: Math

1. In 2014, 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 2014, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 73% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 33% 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 2014, 71% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 66% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 22% 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 2014, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 83% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 50% 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 2014, 78% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 76% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 17% 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.

Supporting
Data:

3. 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 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 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 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.
4. In 2012, 76% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 69% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and

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

5. Students have scored an average of 19.7 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 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: Tutoring Program.
Scientific Based Research: Gil G. Norm (2004). After School Education: A New Ally for Education Reform, 1-3.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Teachers will provide ACT tutoring and preparation for students. The tutoring will be provided to enhance student learning in the four areas tested under the ACT. The program will be called Salem ACT Academy. Teachers will be paid \$30.00 per hour. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 3.7.	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$1,660.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1,660.00
Total Budget:				\$1,660.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$30182

Priority 1: Literacy

- In 2014, 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.
- In 2014, 78% 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 2014 90% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 85% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 33% 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 2014, 86% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 84% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 56% 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.
- 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

Supporting Data:

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.

4. 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.
5. Students have scored an average of 18.5 on the ACT exam in English and a 20 in reading during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists 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	Wayne	Start:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative 	NSLA

(classroom size reduction) 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. The CSR teacher will be providing a section of the course in addition to what is required. In the seventh grade, one period of English is above the required sections (Amanda Himschoot from 20 to 15) FTE =0.2857. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Guiltner, Principal	07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	(State-281) - \$12,928.00 Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$12,928.00
Total Budget:				\$12,928.00

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. The interventionist will be used to supplement instruction and help students succeed in their courses. FTE = 0.1905	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$10,054.00 Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$10,054.00
Total Budget:				\$10,054.00

Priority 2: Math

1. In 2014, 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 2014, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 73% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 33% 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 2014, 71% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 66% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 22% 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 2014, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 83% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 50% 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 2014, 78% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 76% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 17% 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 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.

4. 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 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.

- Students have scored an average of 19.7 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 school years.
- 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: Tutoring Program.				
Scientific Based Research: Gil G. Norm (2004). After School Education: A New Ally for Education Reform, 1-3.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Teachers will provide ACT tutoring and preparation for students. The tutoring will be provided to enhance student learning in the four areas tested under the ACT. The program will be called Salem ACT Academy. Teachers will be paid \$30.00 per hour. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, teachers rated this intervention 3.7.	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - \$7,200.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$7,200.00
Total Budget:				\$7,200.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$5000

Priority 1: Literacy

- In 2014, 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.
- In 2014, 78% 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 2014 90% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 85% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 33% 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 2014, 86% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 84% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 56% 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 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.

4. 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

Supporting
Data:

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.

5. Students have scored an average of 18.5 on the ACT exam in English and a 20 in reading during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists 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: Technology will be purchased to improve educational opportunities in the classroom.				
Scientific Based Research: Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning; (September 2014) Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education/Alliance for Excellent Education 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: Printers will be purchased for high school classrooms, one white board, and 22 chrome casts. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$5,000.00 & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$5,000.00
Total Budget:				\$5,000.00

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 -- \$11200

Priority 1: Literacy

1. In 2014, 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 2014, 78% 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 2014 90% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 85% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 33% 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 2014, 86% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 84% of the socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 56% 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 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.
4. 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

Supporting
Data:

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.

5. Students have scored an average of 18.5 on the ACT exam in English and a 20 in reading during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 school years.
6. The 2013 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists 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: To create positive parent relationships that will allow parents to be involved in their child's education by following parent engagement actions that reflect all requirements of ACT 307 of 2007 and ACT 397 of 2009 and any supplemental funded activities.				
Scientific Based Research: McDonald, Erma. Developing Positive Parent Partnerships. Education World, October 7, 2005. www.education.com				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Blackboard Connect will be purchased to send messages to parents with the intent to inform parents of school programs and activities in addition to other modes of communication with parents. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 05/31/2014		NSLA (State-281) - \$1,000.00 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$1,000.00
Total Budget:				\$1,000.00
Intervention: Technology will be purchased to improve educational opportunities in the classroom.				
Scientific Based Research: Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning; (September 2014) Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education/Alliance for Excellent Education 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
The district will purchase Canvas by Instructure for the grade 7-12 Learning Management Software (LMS). The LMS will be used to incorporate blended learning/digital learning and meet the requirements of Act 1280. Students will complete assignments and be able to submit those assignments to their teachers through the LMS.	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - \$7,400.00 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$7,400.00
Total Budget:				\$7,400.00

Priority 2: Math

1. In 2014, 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 2014, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 73% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 33% 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 2014, 71% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 66% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 22% 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 2014, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 83% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 50% 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 2014, 78% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 76% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 17% 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 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

Supporting
Data:

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.

4. 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 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.

5. Students have scored an average of 19.7 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2012, 2013, and 2014 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. Data from the exam will be used to enhance the learning in classrooms. Students will take the exam in March through April. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative Staff Central Office District Staff Teachers 	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$2,800.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$2,800.00
Total Budget:				\$2,800.00

SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$64483.24

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 -- \$3025

Priority 4: State Support

- Supporting Data:
1. Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2014-15 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Better preparation for open-response questions 4. Instructional strategies that engage students 5. Using technology in the classroom. 6. Using technology to increase student achievement for at-risk students.
 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2014-15 school-year.

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 2014-15, 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: The district will incorporate the use of technology for teaching and learning. The goal is improve student access to learning materials and increase student achievement for all students. In addition, the technology use will specifically target at-risk student learning.				
Scientific Based Research: Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning; (September 2014) Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education/Alliance for Excellent Education				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Technology materials, supplies, and equipment will be purchased to support the use of instructional programs. The district will purchase and/or replace technology equipment necessary to deliver the instructional programs and other technology-related teaching and learning tools. 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, student achievement, digital learning opportunities, to support at-risk students' learning. Materials and supplies to be purchased include networking cables, toner, replacement screens/keyboardschargers for chromebooks,	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$3,025.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$3,025.00

battery back-ups, replacement keyboards/mice/monitors for desktops, connectors, adaptors, wall-mount brackets, cameras, microphones, Windows server licenses, dameware, adobe acrobat professional Purchased Service is Ecessa and gScholar maintenance fees. Capital Outlay item will be an Ecessa shield link aggregator. Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Total Budget:				\$3,025.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6751.24

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 30,960.00 Benefits 6751.24. 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: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	NSLA (State-281) - \$6,751.24 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,751.24
Total Budget:				\$6,751.24

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$30960

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 30,960.00 Benefits 6751.24. 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: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	NSLA (State-281) - \$30,960.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$30,960.00
Total Budget:				\$30,960.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$22597

Priority 4: State Support

- Supporting Data:
1. Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2014-15 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Better preparation for open-response questions 4. Instructional strategies that engage students 5. Using technology in the classroom. 6. Using technology to increase student achievement for at-risk students.
 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2014-15 school-year.

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 2014-15, 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: The district will incorporate the use of technology for teaching and learning. The goal is improve student access to learning materials and increase student achievement for all students. In addition, the technology use will specifically target at-risk student learning.				
Scientific Based Research: Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning; (September 2014) Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education/Alliance for Excellent Education				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Technology materials, supplies, and equipment will be purchased to support the use of instructional programs. The district will purchase and/or replace technology equipment necessary to deliver the instructional programs and other technology-related teaching and learning tools. 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, student achievement, digital learning opportunities, to support at-risk students' learning. Materials and supplies to be purchased include networking cables, toner, replacement screens/keyboardschargers for chromebooks, battery back-ups, replacement keyboards/mice/monitors for desktops, connectors, adaptors, wall-mount brackets, cameras, microphones, Windows server licenses, dameware, adobe acrobat professional Purchased Service is Ecessa and gScholar maintenance fees. Capital Outlay item will be an Ecessa shield link aggregator. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$22,597.00 ACTION BUDGET: \$22,597.00
Total Budget:				\$22,597.00

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 -- \$1150

Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data: 1. 1.Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2014-15 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Better preparation for open-response questions 4. Instructional strategies that engage students 5. Using technology in the classroom. 6. Using technology to increase student achievement for at-risk students.

2. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2014-15 school-year.

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 2014-15, 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: The district will incorporate the use of technology for teaching and learning. The goal is improve student access to learning materials and increase student achievement for all students. In addition, the technology use will specifically target at-risk student learning.

Scientific Based Research: Using Technology to Support At-Risk Students' Learning; (September 2014) Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education/Alliance for Excellent Education

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>Technology materials, supplies, and equipment will be purchased to support the use of instructional programs. The district will purchase and/or replace technology equipment necessary to deliver the instructional programs and other technology-related teaching and learning tools. 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, student achievement, digital learning opportunities, to support at-risk students' learning. Materials and supplies to be purchased include networking cables, toner, replacement screens/keyboards/chargers for chromebooks, battery back-ups, replacement keyboards/mice/monitors for desktops, connectors, adaptors, wall-mount brackets, cameras, microphones, Windows server licenses, dameware, adobe acrobat professional Purchased Service is Ecessa and gScholar maintenance fees. Capital Outlay item will be an Ecessa shield link aggregator. Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Shaun Windsor</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015</p>		<p>NSLA (State-281) - \$1,150.00 Purchased Services:</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$1,150.00</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$1,150.00</p>