



# 2011-2012 ARCHIVE

## Source of Funds Report

JASPER SCHOOL DISTRICT

### 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: \$438193

Generated on September 16, 2014

### JASPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$51623

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$10532

**Priority 1:** Literacy

**Goal:** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6505

**Priority 1:** Literacy

**Goal:** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$26011

**Priority 1:** Literacy

**Goal:** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859

**Priority 1:** Literacy

**Goal:** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and

word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.  
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 -- \$5716

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

**JASPER HIGH SCHOOL -- \$66352**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$18902

**Priority 1: To Improve Math Skills**

**Goal:** All students in 7th and 8th grade will improve their mathematics performance in answering Open Response Items in Geometry, Measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. Algebra: All students will improve their algebra performance in answering Open Response questions Language of Algebra, Linear Functions, and Non-Linear Functions.

**Priority 2: To Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** All high School students will improve their performance in writing abilities in the areas of content, style, and multiple choice writing and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$7645

**Priority 1: To Improve Math Skills**

**Goal:** All students in 7th and 8th grade will improve their mathematics performance in answering Open Response Items in Geometry, Measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. Algebra: All students will improve their algebra performance in answering Open Response questions Language of Algebra, Linear Functions, and Non-Linear Functions.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$31230

**Priority 1: To Improve Math Skills**

**Goal:** All students in 7th and 8th grade will improve their mathematics performance in answering Open Response Items in Geometry, Measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. Algebra: All students will improve their algebra performance in answering Open Response questions Language of Algebra, Linear Functions, and Non-Linear Functions.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859

**Priority 2: To Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** All high School students will improve their performance in writing abilities in the areas of content, style, and multiple choice writing and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages.

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 -- \$5716

**Priority 2: To Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** All high School students will improve their performance in writing abilities in the areas of content, style, and multiple choice writing and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages.

**JASPER SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$91500**

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 -- \$16500

**Priority 1: Administrative Support For Academic Achievement**

**Goal:** All school district students assessed on grades 3,4,5,6,7,8 Benchmark Exams, 11th Grade Literacy Exam, and Algebra and Geometry End of Course Exams will score proficient or advanced. Ninety-five percent of the Combined Population students and each subgroup will be tested. The graduation rate and attendance rates for the schools will meet or exceed the State rate. The percent of students scoring proficient/advanced in the Combined Population and all subgroups will meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$75000

**Priority 1: Administrative Support For Academic Achievement**

**Goal:** All school district students assessed on grades 3,4,5,6,7,8 Benchmark Exams, 11th Grade Literacy Exam, and Algebra and Geometry End of Course Exams will score proficient or advanced. Ninety-five percent of the Combined Population students and each subgroup will be tested. The graduation rate and attendance rates for the schools will meet or exceed the State rate. The percent of

students scoring proficient/advanced in the Combined Population and all subgroups will meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies".

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

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

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

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

**KINGSTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$73477**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$7032

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$13285

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

**Priority 3: Wellness**

**Goal:** Kingston Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$44585

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

**Priority 3: Wellness**

**Goal:** Kingston Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

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 -- \$5716

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

**KINGSTON HIGH SCHOOL -- \$59853**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$8937

**Priority 2: Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** The goal for Kingston high school students in literacy is to meet the AYP target of 83.88. It is also the goal for the students to become proficient and fluent readers and writers.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$10275

**Priority 1: Mathematics**

**Goal:** Our goal for Kingston High School students is to meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.30 in the sub-populations of caucasian and economically disadvantaged and to continue to raise open-response scores.

**Priority 3: Wellness**

**Goal:** Kingston High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$34925

**Priority 1: Mathematics**

**Goal:** Our goal for Kingston High School students is to meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.30 in the sub-populations of caucasian and economically disadvantaged and to continue to raise open-response scores.

**Priority 3: Wellness**

**Goal:** Kingston High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$0

There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies".

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 -- \$5716

**Priority 2: Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** The goal for Kingston high school students in literacy is to meet the AYP target of 83.88. It is also the goal for the students to become proficient and fluent readers and writers.

**OARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$44425**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$6092

**Priority 1: To Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** All students will improve their reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6752

**Priority 2: Improve Mathematics Skills**

**Goal:** All students will show an improvement in math problem solving skills.

**Priority 3: Wellness**

**Goal:** Oark Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$23006

**Priority 2: Improve Mathematics Skills**

**Goal:** All students will show an improvement in math problem solving skills.

**Priority 3: Wellness**

**Goal:** Oark Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859

**Priority 1: To Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** All students will improve their reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum.

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 -- \$5716

**Priority 1: To Improve Literacy Skills**

**Goal:** All students will improve their reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum.

**OARK HIGH SCHOOL -- \$50963**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$12629

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6753

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.

**Priority 3: Wellness**

**Goal:** Oark High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$23006

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.

**Priority 3:** Wellness

**Goal:** Oak High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859

**Priority 1:** Literacy

**Goal:** All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.

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 -- \$5716

**Priority 1:** Literacy

**Goal:** All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.

---

### **JASPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$51623**

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 -- \$10532**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT STATEMENT:
- 2.
3. 2008-2011 test data in grades 3-6 shows overall weakness in Reading Open
4. Response. The 2009 - 2011 test data show gains in the goal to reduce the
5. scoring gap between males and females and also in the area of economically
6. disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. LITERACY:
13. ITBS and Sat 10 Test Results:
- 14.
15. 2010 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:70% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 16.
17. 2009 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:82% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 18.
19. 2008 SAT 10, KINDERGARTEN:
20. No available data due to state wide testing problem.
- 21.
- 22.
23. 2010 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 24.

Supporting  
Data:

25. 2009 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 49% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 26.
27. 2008 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE:
28. 42% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the first
29. grade SAT 10 in reading. 42% of Caucasian students scored at or above
30. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) 43% of Economically
31. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of students with
32. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
33. N/A.
- 34.
- 35.
36. 2010 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 48% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 37.
38. 2009 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 41% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 39.
40. 2008 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE:
41. 47% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the second
42. grade SAT 10 in reading. 47% of the Caucasian population scored at or above
43. proficient, (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) while 40% of the
44. economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 33% of
45. students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for
46. all populations was N/A.
- 47.
- 48.
- 49.
- 50.
51. 2008 SAT 10, THIRD GRADE:
52. 53% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the third
53. grade SAT 10 in reading. 53% of Caucasian students scored at or above
54. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 55% of Economically
55. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 25% of students with
56. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
57. was N/A.
- 58.
- 59.
- 60.
61. SAT 10, 2008, FOURTH GRADE:

62. 68% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the fourth
63. grade SAT 10. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no other
64. ethnic sub groups were tested). 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students
65. scored at or above proficient. 14% of students with disabilities scored at or
66. above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 67.
- 68.
- 69.
- 70.
71. 2008 SAT 10, FIFTH GRADE:
72. 68% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the fifth grade
73. SAT 10 in reading. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no
74. other ethnic sub groups were tested). 59% of Economically Disadvantaged
75. students scored at or above proficient. 44% of Students with Disabilities
76. scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
80. SAT 10 2008, SIXTH GRADE:
81. 32% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the sixth
82. grade SAT 10 in reading. 32% of Caucasian students scored at or above
83. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 25% of Economically
84. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of Students with
85. Disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
86. was N/A.
- 87.
- 88.
- 89.
- 90.
- 91.
92. DATA AND THREE YEAR TRENDS:
- 93.
94. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam
- 95.
96. Combined Population:2008/2009/2010/2011
97. Proficient or Advanced
98. 75%-75%-77%-72%~~
- 99.
100. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011
101. Proficient or Advanced
102. 70%, 68%, 79%, 72%~~

103.  
104. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
105. Proficient or Advanced  
106. 74%, 75%, 77%, 72%  
107.  
108.  
109. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
110. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
111. area(s) are: Reading Open Response.  
112. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing  
113. domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
114.  
115.  
116. Benchmark 4th Grade Literacy Exam  
117.  
118. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
119. Proficient or Advanced  
120. 74%, 60%, 71%, 66%  
121.  
122.  
123. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011  
124. Proficient or Advanced  
125. 71%, 62%, 61%, 73%  
126.  
127. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
128. Proficient or Advanced  
129. 74%, 62%, 74%, 66%  
130.  
131. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 71% scored proficient or advanced,  
132. In 2009, 62%scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 74% scored proficient or  
133. advanced.  
134.  
135. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
136. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
137. area(s) are: Reading Open Response. The 3 year trend analysis of the  
138. open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest  
139. identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
140.  
141.  
142. Benchmark 5th Grade Literacy Exam  
143.  
144. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
145. Proficient or Advanced  
146. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
147.  
148.



149. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
150. Proficient or Advanced  
151. 56%, 73%, 56%, 85%  
152.  
153.  
154. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
155. Proficient or Advanced  
156. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
157.  
158.  
159. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
160. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
161. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical and Content. The 3 year trend  
162. analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed  
163. that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
164.  
165.  
166. Benchmark 6th Grade Literacy Exam  
167.  
168. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
169. Proficient or Advanced  
170. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
171.  
172.  
173.  
174. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
175. Proficient or Advanced  
176. 74%, 69%, 77%, 82%  
177.  
178.  
179. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
180. Prficient or Advanced  
181. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
182.  
183.  
184.  
185. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
186. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
187. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of  
188. the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the  
189. lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
190.  
191.  
192.  
193.  
194.  
195.

- 196.
- 197.
- 198.
- 199. Jasper Elementary School's Attendance Rate for
- 200. 2010-2011 96%
- 201. 2009-2010 96%
- 202.
- 203.
- 204.
- 205.
- 206.
- 207.
- 208.
- 209.
- 210.
- 211.
- 212.
- 213.

**Goal** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2010 AYP target of 79.40, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

**Intervention:** The staff at Jasper Elementary School will utilize the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment. The staff will utilize the Learning Institute for curriculum alignment.

**Scientific Based Research:** Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment:From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds to purchase a set of 16 Apple I Pads, protective covers, charging station cart docking computer and student applications (apps), and protective insurance to address the areas of content and style, multiple choice writing, and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages. Teachers will evaluate the effectiveness by assigning projects that align with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will also evaluate using TLI module tests to determine if students are reaching those objectives. This program is supplemental to other programs provided for with local funds.	David Dunlap	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - \$10,532.00 Capital Outlay: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$10,532.00

Action Type: Equity				
Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Total Budget:				\$10,532.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6505**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT STATEMENT:
- 2.
3. 2008-2011 test data in grades 3-6 shows overall weakness in Reading Open
4. Response. The 2009 - 2011 test data show gains in the goal to reduce the
5. scoring gap between males and females and also in the area of economically
6. disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. LITERACY:
13. ITBS and Sat 10 Test Results:
- 14.
15. 2010 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:70% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 16.
17. 2009 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:82% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 18.
19. 2008 SAT 10, KINDERGARTEN:
20. No available data due to state wide testing problem.
- 21.
- 22.
23. 2010 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 24.
25. 2009 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 49% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 26.
27. 2008 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE:
28. 42% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the first
29. grade SAT 10 in reading. 42% of Caucasian students scored at or above
30. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were rested) 43% of Economically
31. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of students with
32. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
33. N/A.
- 34.
- 35.
36. 2010 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 48% had an NPR score of 50, or above.

Supporting Data:

- 37.
38. 2009 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 41% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 39.
40. 2008 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE:
41. 47% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the second
42. grade SAT 10 in reading. 47% of the Caucasian population scored at or above
43. proficient, (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) while 40% of the
44. economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 33% of
45. students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for
46. all populations was N/A.
- 47.
- 48.
- 49.
- 50.
51. 2008 SAT 10, THIRD GRADE:
52. 53% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the third
53. grade SAT 10 in reading. 53% of Caucasian students scored at or above
54. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 55% of Economically
55. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 25% of students with
56. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
57. was N/A.
- 58.
- 59.
- 60.
61. SAT 10, 2008, FOURTH GRADE:
62. 68% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the fourth
63. grade SAT 10. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no other
64. ethnic sub groups were tested). 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students
65. scored at or above proficient. 14% of students with disabilities scored at or
66. above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 67.
- 68.
- 69.
- 70.
71. 2008 SAT 10, FIFTH GRADE:
72. 68% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the fifth grade
73. SAT 10 in reading. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no

74. other ethnic sub groups were tested). 59% of Economically Disadvantaged  
75. students scored at or above proficient. 44% of Students with Disabilities  
76. scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.  
77.  
78.  
79.  
80. SAT 10 2008, SIXTH GRADE:  
81. 32% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the sixth  
82. grade SAT 10 in reading. 32% of Caucasian students scored at or above  
83. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 25% of Economically  
84. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of Students with  
85. Disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations  
86. was N/A.  
87.  
88.  
89.  
90.  
91.  
92. DATA AND THREE YEAR TRENDS:  
93.  
94. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam  
95.  
96. Combined Population:2008/2009/2010/2011  
97. Proficient or Advanced  
98. 75%-75%-77%-72%~~  
99.  
100. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011  
101. Proficient or Advanced  
102. 70%, 68%, 79%, 72%~~  
103.  
104. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
105. Proficient or Advanced  
106. 74%, 75%, 77%, 72%  
107.  
108.  
109. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
110. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
111. area(s) are: Reading Open Response.  
112. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing  
113. domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
114.  
115.  
116. Benchmark 4th Grade Literacy Exam  
117.

118. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
119. Proficient or Advanced  
120. 74%, 60%, 71%, 66%  
121.  
122.  
123. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011  
124. Proficient or Advanced  
125. 71%, 62%, 61%, 73%  
126.  
127. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
128. Proficient or Advanced  
129. 74%, 62%, 74%, 66%  
130.  
131. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 71% scored  
proficient or advanced,  
132. In 2009, 62%scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 74%  
scored proficient or  
133. advanced.  
134.  
135. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and  
multiple-choice questions,  
136. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that  
the lowest identified  
137. area(s) are: Reading Open Response. The 3 year trend  
analysis of the  
138. open-response questions in the five writing domains  
revealed that the lowest  
139. identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
140.  
141.  
142. Benchmark 5th Grade Literacy Exam  
143.  
144. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
145. Proficient or Advanced  
146. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
147.  
148.  
149. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
150. Proficient or Advanced  
151. 56%, 73%, 56%, 85%  
152.  
153.  
154. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
155. Proficient or Advanced  
156. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
157.  
158.  
159. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and  
multiple-choice questions,  
160. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that  
the lowest identified  
161. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical and  
Content. The 3 year trend  
162. analysis of the open-response questions in the five  
writing domains revealed

163. that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
164.  
165.  
166. Benchmark 6th Grade Literacy Exam  
167.  
168. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
169. Proficient or Advanced  
170. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
171.  
172.  
173.  
174. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
175. Proficient or Advanced  
176. 74%, 69%, 77%, 82%  
177.  
178.  
179. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
180. Prficient or Advanced  
181. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
182.  
183.  
184.  
185. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
186. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
187. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of  
188. the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the  
189. lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
190.  
191.  
192.  
193.  
194.  
195.  
196.  
197.  
198.  
199. Jasper Elementary School's Attendance Rate for  
200. 2010-2011 96%  
201. 2009-2010 96%  
202.  
203.  
204.  
205.  
206.  
207.  
208.  
209.  
210.  
211.  
212.

Goal Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

Benchmark In 2011 the AYP target of was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2010 AYP target of 79.40, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper Elementary School will utilize the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment. The staff will utilize the Learning Institute for curriculum alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment:From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .50 FTE highly qualified Elementary Counselor to supplement required .50 counseling position to full time elementary counselor. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Jeff Cantrell	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$6,505.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,505.00
Total Budget:				\$6,505.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$26011**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT STATEMENT:
  - 2.
  3. 2008-2011 test data in grades 3-6 shows overall weakness in Reading Open
  4. Response. The 2009 - 2011 test data show gains in the goal to reduce the
  5. scoring gap between males and females and also in the area of economically
  6. disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged.
  - 7.
  - 8.
  - 9.
  - 10.
  - 11.
  12. LITERACY:
  13. ITBS and Sat 10 Test Results:
  - 14.
- Supporting Data:



15. 2010 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:70% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 16.
17. 2009 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:82% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 18.
19. 2008 SAT 10, KINDERGARTEN:
20. No available data due to state wide testing problem.
- 21.
- 22.
23. 2010 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 24.
25. 2009 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 49% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 26.
27. 2008 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE:
28. 42% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the first
29. grade SAT 10 in reading. 42% of Caucasian students scored at or above
30. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) 43% of Economically
31. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of students with
32. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
33. N/A.
- 34.
- 35.
36. 2010 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 48% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 37.
38. 2009 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 41% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 39.
40. 2008 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE:
41. 47% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the second
42. grade SAT 10 in reading. 47% of the Caucasian population scored at or above
43. proficient, (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) while 40% of the
44. economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 33% of
45. students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for
46. all populations was N/A.
- 47.
- 48.
- 49.
- 50.
51. 2008 SAT 10, THIRD GRADE:
52. 53% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the third

53. grade SAT 10 in reading. 53% of Caucasian students scored at or above
54. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 55% of Economically
55. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 25% of students with
56. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
57. was N/A.
- 58.
- 59.
- 60.
61. SAT 10, 2008, FOURTH GRADE:
62. 68% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the fourth
63. grade SAT 10. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no other
64. ethnic sub groups were tested). 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students
65. scored at or above proficient. 14% of students with disabilities scored at or
66. above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 67.
- 68.
- 69.
- 70.
71. 2008 SAT 10, FIFTH GRADE:
72. 68% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the fifth grade
73. SAT 10 in reading. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no
74. other ethnic sub groups were tested). 59% of Economically Disadvantaged
75. students scored at or above proficient. 44% of Students with Disabilities
76. scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
80. SAT 10 2008, SIXTH GRADE:
81. 32% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the sixth
82. grade SAT 10 in reading. 32% of Caucasian students scored at or above
83. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 25% of Economically
84. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of Students with
85. Disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
86. was N/A.
- 87.
- 88.
- 89.

90.  
91.  
92. DATA AND THREE YEAR TRENDS:  
93.  
94. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam  
95.  
96. Combined Population:2008/2009/2010/2011  
97. Proficient or Advanced  
98. 75%-75%-77%-72%~~  
99.  
100. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011  
101. Proficient or Advanced  
102. 70%, 68%, 79%, 72%~~  
103.  
104. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
105. Proficient or Advanced  
106. 74%, 75%, 77%, 72%  
107.  
108.  
109. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and  
multiple-choice questions,  
110. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that  
the lowest identified  
111. area(s) are: Reading Open Response.  
112. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response  
questions in the five writing  
113. domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s)  
are: Content and Style.  
114.  
115.  
116. Benchmark 4th Grade Literacy Exam  
117.  
118. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
119. Proficient or Advanced  
120. 74%, 60%, 71%, 66%  
121.  
122.  
123. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011  
124. Proficient or Advanced  
125. 71%, 62%, 61%, 73%  
126.  
127. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
128. Proficient or Advanced  
129. 74%, 62%, 74%, 66%  
130.  
131. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 71% scored  
proficient or advanced,  
132. In 2009, 62%scored proficient or advanced. In 2008,  
74% scored proficient or  
133. advanced.  
134.  
135. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and  
multiple-choice questions,  
136. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that  
the lowest identified

137. area(s) are: Reading Open Response. The 3 year trend analysis of the  
138. open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest  
139. identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
140.  
141.  
142. Benchmark 5th Grade Literacy Exam  
143.  
144. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
145. Proficient or Advanced  
146. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
147.  
148.  
149. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
150. Proficient or Advanced  
151. 56%, 73%, 56%, 85%  
152.  
153.  
154. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
155. Proficient or Advanced  
156. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
157.  
158.  
159. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
160. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
161. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical and Content. The 3 year trend  
162. analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed  
163. that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
164.  
165.  
166. Benchmark 6th Grade Literacy Exam  
167.  
168. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
169. Proficient or Advanced  
170. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
171.  
172.  
173.  
174. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
175. Proficient or Advanced  
176. 74%, 69%, 77%, 82%  
177.  
178.  
179. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
180. Prficient or Advanced  
181. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
182.  
183.  
184.

- 185. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,
- 186. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified
- 187. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of
- 188. the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the
- 189. lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.
- 190.
- 191.
- 192.
- 193.
- 194.
- 195.
- 196.
- 197.
- 198.
- 199. Jasper Elementary School's Attendance Rate for
- 200. 2010-2011 96%
- 201. 2009-2010 96%
- 202.
- 203.
- 204.
- 205.
- 206.
- 207.
- 208.
- 209.
- 210.
- 211.
- 212.
- 213.

**Goal** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2010 AYP target of 79.40, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper Elementary School will utilize the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment. The staff will utilize the Learning Institute for curriculum alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment:From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

Hire .50 FTE highly qualified Elementary Counselor to supplement required .50 counseling position to full time elementary counselor. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Jeff Cantrell	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	• Administrative Staff	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$26,011.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$26,011.00
Total Budget:				\$26,011.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT STATEMENT:
- 2.
3. 2008-2011 test data in grades 3-6 shows overall weakness in Reading Open
4. Response. The 2009 - 2011 test data show gains in the goal to reduce the
5. scoring gap between males and females and also in the area of economically
6. disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. LITERACY:
13. ITBS and Sat 10 Test Results:
- 14.
15. 2010 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:70% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 16.
17. 2009 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:82% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 18.
19. 2008 SAT 10, KINDERGARTEN:
20. No available data due to state wide testing problem.
- 21.
- 22.
23. 2010 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 24.
25. 2009 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 49% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 26.
27. 2008 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE:
28. 42% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the first
29. grade SAT 10 in reading. 42% of Caucasian students scored at or above

Supporting Data:

30. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) 43% of Economically
31. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of students with
32. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
33. N/A.
- 34.
- 35.
36. 2010 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 48% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 37.
38. 2009 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 41% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 39.
40. 2008 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE:
41. 47% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the second
42. grade SAT 10 in reading. 47% of the Caucasian population scored at or above
43. proficient, (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) while 40% of the
44. economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 33% of
45. students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for
46. all populations was N/A.
- 47.
- 48.
- 49.
- 50.
51. 2008 SAT 10, THIRD GRADE:
52. 53% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the third
53. grade SAT 10 in reading. 53% of Caucasian students scored at or above
54. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 55% of Economically
55. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 25% of students with
56. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
57. was N/A.
- 58.
- 59.
- 60.
61. SAT 10, 2008, FOURTH GRADE:
62. 68% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the fourth
63. grade SAT 10. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no other
64. ethnic sub groups were tested). 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students
65. scored at or above proficient. 14% of students with disabilities scored at or

66. above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 67.
- 68.
- 69.
- 70.
71. 2008 SAT 10, FIFTH GRADE:
72. 68% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the fifth grade
73. SAT 10 in reading. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no
74. other ethnic sub groups were tested). 59% of Economically Disadvantaged
75. students scored at or above proficient. 44% of Students with Disabilities
76. scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
80. SAT 10 2008, SIXTH GRADE:
81. 32% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the sixth
82. grade SAT 10 in reading. 32% of Caucasian students scored at or above
83. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 25% of Economically
84. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of Students with
85. Disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
86. was N/A.
- 87.
- 88.
- 89.
- 90.
- 91.
92. DATA AND THREE YEAR TRENDS:
- 93.
94. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam
- 95.
96. Combined Population:2008/2009/2010/2011
97. Proficient or Advanced
98. 75%-75%-77%-72%~~
- 99.
100. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011
101. Proficient or Advanced
102. 70%, 68%, 79%, 72%~~
- 103.
104. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011
105. Proficient or Advanced
106. 74%, 75%, 77%, 72%
- 107.
- 108.
109. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,



110. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified

111. area(s) are: Reading Open Response.

112. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing

113. domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.

114.

115.

116. Benchmark 4th Grade Literacy Exam

117.

118. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011

119. Proficient or Advanced

120. 74%, 60%, 71%, 66%

121.

122.

123. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011

124. Proficient or Advanced

125. 71%, 62%, 61%, 73%

126.

127. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011

128. Proficient or Advanced

129. 74%, 62%, 74%, 66%

130.

131. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 71% scored proficient or advanced,

132. In 2009, 62%scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 74% scored proficient or

133. advanced.

134.

135. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,

136. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified

137. area(s) are: Reading Open Response. The 3 year trend analysis of the

138. open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest

139. identified area(s) are: Content and Style.

140.

141.

142. Benchmark 5th Grade Literacy Exam

143.

144. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011

145. Proficient or Advanced

146. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%

147.

148.

149. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011

150. Proficient or Advanced

151. 56%, 73%, 56%, 85%

152.

153.

154. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011

155. Proficient or Advanced

156. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%

157.  
158.  
159. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
160. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
161. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical and Content. The 3 year trend  
162. analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed  
163. that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
164.  
165.  
166. Benchmark 6th Grade Literacy Exam  
167.  
168. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
169. Proficient or Advanced  
170. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
171.  
172.  
173.  
174. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
175. Proficient or Advanced  
176. 74%, 69%, 77%, 82%  
177.  
178.  
179. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
180. Prficient or Advanced  
181. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
182.  
183.  
184.  
185. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
186. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
187. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of  
188. the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the  
189. lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
190.  
191.  
192.  
193.  
194.  
195.  
196.  
197.  
198.  
199. Jasper Elementary School's Attendance Rate for  
200. 2010-2011 96%  
201. 2009-2010 96%  
202.  
203.

- 204.
- 205.
- 206.
- 207.
- 208.
- 209.
- 210.
- 211.
- 212.
- 213.

**Goal** Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2010 AYP target of 79.40, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper Elementary School will utilize the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment. The staff will utilize the Learning Institute for curriculum alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment:From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of supplemental reading materials. Items such as but not limited to books, magazines, or newspapers. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$2,859.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,859.00
Total Budget:				\$2,859.00

**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 -- \$5716**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT STATEMENT:
  - 2.
  3. 2008-2011 test data in grades 3-6 shows overall weakness in Reading Open
  4. Response. The 2009 - 2011 test data show gains in the goal to reduce the
  5. scoring gap between males and females and also in the area of economically
  6. disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged.
  - 7.
- Supporting Data:**

- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. LITERACY:
13. ITBS and Sat 10 Test Results:
- 14.
15. 2010 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:70% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 16.
17. 2009 SAT 10 KINDERGARTEN:82% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 18.
19. 2008 SAT 10, KINDERGARTEN:
20. No available data due to state wide testing problem.
- 21.
- 22.
23. 2010 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 60% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 24.
25. 2009 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE: 49% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 26.
27. 2008 SAT 10, FIRST GRADE:
28. 42% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the first
29. grade SAT 10 in reading. 42% of Caucasian students scored at or above
30. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) 43% of Economically
31. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of students with
32. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
33. N/A.
- 34.
- 35.
36. 2010 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 48% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 37.
38. 2009 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE: 41% had an NPR score of 50, or above.
- 39.
40. 2008 SAT 10, SECOND GRADE:
41. 47% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the second
42. grade SAT 10 in reading. 47% of the Caucasian population scored at or above
43. proficient, (no other ethnic sub groups were tested) while 40% of the
44. economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 33% of
45. students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for
46. all populations was N/A.
- 47.

- 48.
- 49.
- 50.
51. 2008 SAT 10, THIRD GRADE:
52. 53% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the third
53. grade SAT 10 in reading. 53% of Caucasian students scored at or above
54. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 55% of Economically
55. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 25% of students with
56. disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations
57. was N/A.
- 58.
- 59.
- 60.
61. SAT 10, 2008, FOURTH GRADE:
62. 68% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the fourth
63. grade SAT 10. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no other
64. ethnic sub groups were tested). 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students
65. scored at or above proficient. 14% of students with disabilities scored at or
66. above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 67.
- 68.
- 69.
- 70.
71. 2008 SAT 10, FIFTH GRADE:
72. 68% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the fifth grade
73. SAT 10 in reading. 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient (no
74. other ethnic sub groups were tested). 59% of Economically Disadvantaged
75. students scored at or above proficient. 44% of Students with Disabilities
76. scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations was N/A.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
80. SAT 10 2008, SIXTH GRADE:
81. 32% of combined population students scored at or above proficient on the sixth
82. grade SAT 10 in reading. 32% of Caucasian students scored at or above
83. proficient (no other ethnic sub groups were tested). 25% of Economically
84. Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 0% of Students with

85. Disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest area for all populations

86. was N/A.

87.

88.

89.

90.

91.

92. DATA AND THREE YEAR TRENDS:

93.

94. Benchmark-3rd Grade Literacy Exam

95.

96. Combined Population:2008/2009/2010/2011

97. Proficient or Advanced

98. 75%-75%-77%-72%~~

99.

100. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011

101. Proficient or Advanced

102. 70%, 68%, 79%, 72%~~

103.

104. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011

105. Proficient or Advanced

106. 74%, 75%, 77%, 72%

107.

108.

109. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,

110. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified

111. area(s) are: Reading Open Response.

112. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing

113. domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.

114.

115.

116. Benchmark 4th Grade Literacy Exam

117.

118. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011

119. Proficient or Advanced

120. 74%, 60%, 71%, 66%

121.

122.

123. Economically Disadvantaged:2008,2009,2010,2011

124. Proficient or Advanced

125. 71%, 62%, 61%, 73%

126.

127. Caucasian: 2008,2009,2010,2011

128. Proficient or Advanced

129. 74%, 62%, 74%, 66%

130.

131. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 71% scored proficient or advanced,

132. In 2009, 62%scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 74% scored proficient or

133. advanced.

134.  
135. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
136. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
137. area(s) are: Reading Open Response. The 3 year trend analysis of the  
138. open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest  
139. identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
140.  
141.  
142. Benchmark 5th Grade Literacy Exam  
143.  
144. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
145. Proficient or Advanced  
146. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
147.  
148.  
149. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
150. Proficient or Advanced  
151. 56%, 73%, 56%, 85%  
152.  
153.  
154. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
155. Proficient or Advanced  
156. 70%, 76%, 84%, 88%  
157.  
158.  
159. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,  
160. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified  
161. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical and Content. The 3 year trend  
162. analysis of the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed  
163. that the lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.  
164.  
165.  
166. Benchmark 6th Grade Literacy Exam  
167.  
168. Combined Population:2008,2009,2010,2011  
169. Proficient or Advanced  
170. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%  
171.  
172.  
173.  
174. Economically Disadvantaged: 2008,2009,2010,2011  
175. Proficient or Advanced  
176. 74%, 69%, 77%, 82%  
177.  
178.  
179. Caucasian:2008,2009,2010,2011  
180. Prficient or Advanced

181. 80%, 77%, 80%, 82%
- 182.
- 183.
- 184.
185. The 3 year trend analysis of the open-response and multiple-choice questions,
186. in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified
187. area(s) are: Reading Open Response Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of
188. the open-response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the
189. lowest identified area(s) are: Content and Style.
- 190.
- 191.
- 192.
- 193.
- 194.
- 195.
- 196.
- 197.
- 198.
199. Jasper Elementary School's Attendance Rate for
200. 2010-2011 96%
201. 2009-2010 96%
- 202.
- 203.
- 204.
- 205.
- 206.
- 207.
- 208.
- 209.
- 210.
- 211.
- 212.
- 213.

Goal Elementary School Students will demonstrate literacy improvement in reading comprehension skills using specific strategies in the areas of content, literary, informative text, and practical passages, demonstrating knowledge of expository, persuasive, descriptive, and narrative text and using strategies for visual organization: vocabulary development through use of word skills and word journeys: and written expression skills focusing on content and style in writing prompt areas.

Benchmark In 2011 the AYP target of was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2010 AYP target of 79.40, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper Elementary School will utilize the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment. The staff will utilize the Learning Institute for curriculum alignment.

Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment:From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.



Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of The Learning Institute interim assessment testing service. The Learning Institute also provides literacy, math and science curriculum support. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$5,716.00 Purchased Services: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$5,716.00
Total Budget:				\$5,716.00

**JASPER HIGH SCHOOL -- \$66352**

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 -- \$18902**

Priority 1: To Improve Math Skills

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We have formed a school ACSIP Leadership Team and meet monthly for the purpose of reviewing progress, monitoring data and making adjustments in student interventions. This group has oversight in the implementation of our school improvement plan. (Required by Smart Accountability SI) The group analyzed test results from the following exams: Augmented Benchmark 2009-11. We have examined the results of the Combined Population and the various Subpopulations. The results have been shared with the entire faculty. In addition, we have studied our Graduation rate over the past 3 years. It is our aim to aggregate and disaggregate this data for the purpose of determining student learning needs. We have looked at the trends in order to better shape instruction and align it with the curriculum frameworks, in literacy and math. We recognize there are achievement gaps between subpopulations and we are modifying our curriculum, instruction and assessment practices to better meet the needs of all our populations.
2. 1. We currently have two sub-groups Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. After studying Mathematics, our weakest area is in Open Response. 2. CRITERION REFERENCED CRT (ACTAAP) Combined Population--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--55%-53%-68%-66%~~55-34-37-41 Eighth Grade--59%-66%-52%-56%~~34-50-33-39 EOC Algebra--62%-65%-56%-57%~~48-42-25-23 EOC Geometry--77%-91%-92%-79%~~26-43-39-38 Economically Disadvantaged Student--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--56%-56%-58%63%~~25-23-19-27 Eighth Grade--53%-59%-47%-56%~~17-27-19-25 EOC Algebra--55%-57%-47%-50%~~29-23-17-14 EOC Geometry--75%-94%-94%-72%~~12-17-17-25 Students with Disabilities--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--0%-25%-13%-0%~~9-4-8-7 Eighth Grade--17%-50%-0%-

Supporting Data:

17%~6-4-6 EOC Algebra--10%-0%-50%-0%~10-7-2-1 EOC Geometry--0%-33%-0%-67%~2-3-0-3 3. NORM REFERENCED TEST COMBINED POPULATION Grade 9: STANFORD Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--79%-83% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--39 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Concepts and Problem Solving-57.2% Computation-37.9% ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STANFORD Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--67%-77% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--21 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Concepts and Problem Solving-55% Computation-38.1% 4. GRADUATION RATE: 2010--90.19% 2009--90.8% ATTENDANCE RATE: 2010--98.2% 2009--99%

**Goal** All students in 7th and 8th grade will improve their mathematics performance in answering Open Response Items in Geometry, Measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. Algebra: All students will improve their algebra performance in answering Open Response questions Language of Algebra, Linear Functions, and Non-Linear Functions.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of 73.45 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The Combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.3, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper High School will read and implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa. (2007). Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of an additional television to be utilized in the distance learning classroom where math and literacy classes occur. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Jeff Cantrell	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) \$538.00 - Capital Outlay: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$538.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$538.00</b>

**Priority 2: To Improve Literacy Skills**

1. **NEEDS ASSESSMENT:** Jasper High School consistently scores lower in the area of open response. Jasper High School students in the economically disadvantaged group consistently score lower than the combined population. Jasper High School consistently scores lower in Reading: Content Passage and Writing: Content and Style Domain.
2. 1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. The sub-group Economically Disadvantaged scored only 4 percentage points below the combined population. After studying the Literacy CRT data, our weakest areas are in the domains of Content and Style.  
2. **CRITERION REFERENCED TEST (ACTAAP) Combined Population--**  
2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested  
Seventh Grade 58%-56%-81%-59%~55-34-37-41 Eighth Grade 71%-78%-70%-85%~34-50-33-39 EOC 11 Grade 45%-59%-64%-59%~38-39-39-34  
Economically Disadvantaged--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested  
Seventh Grade 56%-83%-61%-55%~25-23-19-32 Eighth Grade 64%-75%-74%-55%~17-27-19-27 EOC 11 Grade 25%-52%-40%-50%~16-23-15-20 Students with Disabilities--  
2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested  
Seventh Grade 0%-0%-50%-0%~6-4-8-7 Eighth Grade 17%-50%-0%-

**Supporting Data:**

50%~1-6-4-6 EOC 11 Grade 0%-0%-20%-0%~10-10-5-3 3. NORM REFERENCED TEST COMBINED POPULATION STANFORD - READING Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--63%-83% STANFORD - LANGUAGE Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--58%-79% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--29 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Vocabulary-48.2% Comprehension-55.2% ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STANFORD - READING Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--52%-81% STANFORD - LANGUAGE Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--48%-68% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--21 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Vocabulary-42.8% Comprehension-57.1% 4. GRADUATION RATE: 2010--90.19% 2009--90.8% ATTENDANCE RATE: 2010--98.2% 2009--99%

- 3.
- 4.

**Goal** All high School students will improve their performance in writing abilities in the areas of content, style, and multiple choice writing and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper High School will read and implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds to purchase 16 I-Pads, a mobile lab, protective equipment, storage cart, insurance, applications (aps) and licenses to address the areas of content and style, multiple choice writing, and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages. Teachers will evaluate the effectiveness by assigning projects that align with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will also evaluate using TLI module tests to determine if students are reaching those objectives. This program is supplemental to programs already in place with local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity	Jeff Lewis	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$11,003.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$11,003.00
Setting aside funds to purchase 13 e-beam interactive white boards to accompany LCD instruction in the classroom. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Jeff Cantrell	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$7,361.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$7,361.00

Total Budget:	\$18,364.00
---------------	-------------

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$7645**

Priority 1: To Improve Math Skills

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We have formed a school ACSIP Leadership Team and meet monthly for the purpose of reviewing progress, monitoring data and making adjustments in student interventions. This group has oversight in the implementation of our school improvement plan. (Required by Smart Accountability SI) The group analyzed test results from the following exams: Augmented Benchmark 2009-11. We have examined the results of the Combined Population and the various Subpopulations. The results have been shared with the entire faculty. In addition, we have studied our Graduation rate over the past 3 years. It is our aim to aggregate and disaggregate this data for the purpose of determining student learning needs. We have looked at the trends in order to better shape instruction and align it with the curriculum frameworks, in literacy and math. We recognize there are achievement gaps between subpopulations and we are modifying our curriculum, instruction and assessment practices to better meet the needs of all our populations.
2. 1. We currently have two sub-groups Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. After studying Mathematics, our weakest area is in Open Response. 2. CRITERION REFERENCED CRT (ACTAAP) Combined Population--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--55%-53%-68%-66%~~55-34-37-41 Eighth Grade--59%-66%-52%-56%~~34-50-33-39 EOC Algebra--62%-65%-56%-57%~~48-42-25-23 EOC Geometry--77%-91%-92%-79%~~26-43-39-38 Economically Disadvantaged Student--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--56%-56%-58%63%~~25-23-19-27 Eighth Grade--53%-59%-47%-56%~~17-27-19-25 EOC Algebra--55%-57%-47%-50%~~29-23-17-14 EOC Geometry--75%-94%-94%-72%~~12-17-17-25 Students with Disabilities--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--0%-25%-13%-0%~~9-4-8-7 Eighth Grade--17%-50%-0%-17%~~6-6-4-6 EOC Algebra--10%-0%-50%-0%~~10-7-2-1 EOC Geometry--0%-33%-0%-67%~~2-3-0-3 3. NORM REFERENCED TEST COMBINED POPULATION Grade 9: STANFORD Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--79%-83% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--39 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Concepts and Problem Solving-57.2% Computation-37.9% ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STANFORD Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--67%-77% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--21 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Concepts and Problem Solving-55% Computation-38.1% 4. GRADUATION RATE: 2010--90.19% 2009--90.8% ATTENDANCE RATE: 2010--98.2% 2009--99%

Supporting Data:

Goal

All students in 7th and 8th grade will improve their mathematics performance in answering Open Response Items in Geometry, Measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. Algebra: All students will improve their algebra performance in answering Open Response questions Language of Algebra, Linear Functions, and Non-Linear Functions.

Benchmark

In 2011 the AYP target of 73.45 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The Combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.3, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper High School will read and implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .50 FTE highly qualified High School Counselor to supplement required .50 high school counseling position to full time high school counselor. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Jeff Lewis	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$7,645.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$7,645.00
Total Budget:				\$7,645.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$31230**

Priority 1: To Improve Math Skills

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We have formed a school ACSIP Leadership Team and meet monthly for the purpose of reviewing progress, monitoring data and making adjustments in student interventions. This group has oversight in the implementation of our school improvement plan. (Required by Smart Accountability SI) The group analyzed test results from the following exams: Augmented Benchmark 2009-11. We have examined the results of the Combined Population and the various Subpopulations. The results have been shared with the entire faculty. In addition, we have studied our Graduation rate over the past 3 years. It is our aim to aggregate and disaggregate this data for the purpose of determining student learning needs. We have looked at the trends in order to better shape instruction and align it with the curriculum frameworks, in literacy and math. We recognize there are achievement gaps between subpopulations and we are modifying our curriculum, instruction and assessment practices to better meet the needs of all our populations.

Supporting Data:

2. 1. We currently have two sub-groups Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. After studying Mathematics, our weakest area is in Open Response. 2. CRITERION REFERENCED CRT (ACTAAP) Combined Population--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--55%-53%-68%-66%~~55-34-37-41 Eighth Grade--59%-66%-52%-56%~~34-50-33-39 EOC Algebra--62%-65%-56%-57%~~48-42-25-23 EOC Geometry--77%-91%-92%-79%~~26-43-39-38 Economically Disadvantaged Student--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--56%-56%-58%63%~~25-23-19-27 Eighth Grade--53%-59%-47%-56%~~17-27-19-25 EOC Algebra--55%-57%-47%-50%~~29-23-17-14 EOC Geometry--75%-94%-94%-72%~~12-17-17-25 Students with Disabilities--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade--0%-25%-13%-0%~~9-4-8-7 Eighth Grade--17%-50%-0%-17%~~6-6-4-6 EOC Algebra--10%-0%-50%-0%~~10-7-2-1 EOC Geometry--0%-33%-0%-67%~~2-3-0-3 3. NORM REFERENCED TEST COMBINED POPULATION Grade 9: STANFORD Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--79%-83% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--39 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Concepts and Problem Solving-57.2% Computation-37.9% ECOMNOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STANFORD Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--67%-77% IOWA Year 2011

Number Tested--21 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Concepts and Problem Solving-55% Computation-38.1% 4. GRADUATION RATE: 2010--90.19% 2009--90.8% ATTENDANCE RATE: 2010--98.2% 2009--99%

**Goal** All students in 7th and 8th grade will improve their mathematics performance in answering Open Response Items in Geometry, Measurement, and Data Analysis and Probability. Algebra: All students will improve their algebra performance in answering Open Response questions Language of Algebra, Linear Functions, and Non-Linear Functions.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of 73.45 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The Combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.3, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper High School will read and implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .50 FTE highly qualified High School Counselor to supplement required .50 high school counseling position to full time high school counselor. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Jeff Lewis	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$31,230.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$31,230.00
Total Budget:				\$31,230.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859**

Priority 2: To Improve Literacy Skills

Supporting Data:

- NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Jasper High School consistently scores lower in the area of open response. Jasper High School students in the economically disadvantaged group consistently score lower than the combined population. Jasper High School consistently scores lower in Reading: Content Passage and Writing: Content and Style Domain.
1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. The sub-group Economically Disadvantaged scored only 4 percentage points below the combined population. After studying the Literacy CRT data, our weakest areas are in the domains of Content and Style.  
2. CRITERION REFERENCED TEST (ACTAAP) Combined Population--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested Seventh Grade 58%-56%-81%-59%~~55-34-37-41 Eighth Grade 71%-78%-70%-85%~~34-50-33-39 EOC 11 Grade 45%-59%-64%-59%~~38-39-39-34 Economically Disadvantaged--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested Seventh Grade 56%-83%-61%-55%~~25-23-19-32 Eighth Grade 64%-75%-74%-55%~~17-27-19-27 EOC 11 Grade 25%-52%-40%-50%~~16-23-15-20 Students with Disabilities--

2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested  
 Seventh Grade 0%-0%-50%-0&~~6-4-8-7 Eighth Grade 17%-50%-0%-  
 50%~1-6-4-6 EOC 11 Grade 0%-0%-20%-0%~10-10-5-3 3. NORM  
 REFERENCED TEST COMBINED POPULATION STANFORD - READING Year 2009  
 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--63%-83% STANFORD -  
 LANGUAGE Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--  
 58%-79% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--29 % At/Above 50th NPR in:  
 Vocabulary-48.2% Comprehensionn-55.2% ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  
 STANFORD - READING Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--21-31 % At/Above  
 50th NPR--52%-81% STANFORD - LANGUAGE Year 2009 2010 Number  
 Tested--21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--48%-68% IOWA Year 2011 Number  
 Tested--21 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Vocabulary-42.8% Comprehensionn-  
 57.1% 4. GRADUATION RATE: 2010--90.19% 2009--90.8% ATTENDANCE  
 RATE: 2010--98.2% 2009--99%

- 3.
- 4.

Goal All high School students will improve their performance in writing abilities in the areas of content, style, and multiple choice writing and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages.

Benchmark In 2011 the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper High School will read and implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of supplemental reading materials. Items such as but not limited to books, magazines, or newspapers. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Equity	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$2,859.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$2,859.00
Total Budget:				\$2,859.00

**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 -- \$5716**

Priority 2: To Improve Literacy Skills

- Supporting Data:
- 1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Jasper High School consistently scores lower in the area of open response. Jasper High School students in the economically disadvantaged group consistently score lower than the combined population. Jasper High School consistently scores lower in Reading: Content Passage and Writing: Content and Style Domain.
  - 2. 1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. The sub-group Economically Disadvantaged scored only 4 percentage points below the combined population. After studying the Literacy CRT data, our weakest areas are in the domains of Content and Style. 2. CRITERION REFERENCED TEST (ACTAAP) Combined Population--

2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested  
 Seventh Grade 58%-56%-81%-59%~~55-34-37-41 Eighth Grade 71%-78%-  
 70%-85%~~34-50-33-39 EOC 11 Grade 45%-59%-64%-59%~~38-39-39-  
 34 Economically Disadvantaged--2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or  
 Advanced~~Number tested Seventh Grade 56%-83%-61%-55%~~25-23-  
 19-32 Eighth Grade 64%-75%-74%-55%~~17-27-19-27 EOC 11 Grade  
 25%-52%-40%-50%~~16-23-15-20 Students with Disabilities--  
 2008/2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number tested  
 Seventh Grade 0%-0%-50%-0%~~6-4-8-7 Eighth Grade 17%-50%-0%-  
 50%~~1-6-4-6 EOC 11 Grade 0%-0%-20%-0%~~10-10-5-3 3. NORM  
 REFERENCED TEST COMBINED POPULATION STANFORD - READING Year  
 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above 50th NPR--63%-83%  
 STANFORD - LANGUAGE Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--38-53 % At/Above  
 50th NPR--58%-79% IOWA Year 2011 Number Tested--29 % At/Above 50th  
 NPR in: Vocabulary-48.2% Comprehension-55.2% ECONOMICALLY  
 DISADVANTAGED STANFORD - READING Year 2009 2010 Number Tested--  
 21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--52%-81% STANFORD - LANGUAGE Year 2009  
 2010 Number Tested--21-31 % At/Above 50th NPR--48%-68% IOWA Year  
 2011 Number Tested--21 % At/Above 50th NPR in: Vocabulary-42.8%  
 Comprehension-57.1% 4. GRADUATION RATE: 2010--90.19% 2009--90.8%  
 ATTENDANCE RATE: 2010--98.2% 2009--99%

- 3.
- 4.

**Goal** All high School students will improve their performance in writing abilities in the areas of content, style, and multiple choice writing and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Jasper High School will read and implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of The Learning Institute interim assessment testing service, scantron license renewal, and scantron testing supplies. The Learning Institute also provides literacy, math and science curriculum support. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$5,716.00 Purchased Services: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$5,716.00
Total Budget:				\$5,716.00



---

**JASPER SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$91500**

## 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 -- \$16500**

Priority 1: Administrative Support For Academic Achievement

Supporting  
Data:

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY: After analyzing our state assessment data, we looked
2. at collected data from classroom walkthroughs and our vertical and horizontal
3. alignment provided to us from The Learning Institute. We then made needed
4. adjustments to our curriculum as well and planned professional development for
5. identified areas specific to each building. The Jasper and Oak High Schools
6. are in year 1 school improvement.
- 7.
8. Literacy Priority Trend Analysis
9. District Grades K-6
10. 1. Combined Population- 2009-2010-2011
11. 73.4% - 79.9 - 82.3
12. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-6 Grades in Literacy is
13. one of continuous growth.
14. Third Grade, lowest trend area of concern is content. Fourth Grade the lowest
15. trend area of concern is content. Fifth Grade, the lowest trend area of
16. concern is practical. Sixth Grade the lowest trend area of concern is content.
- 17.
- 18.
19. 2. Caucasian Population 2009/2010/2011
20. Grades K-6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam
21. 73.6%, 79.7%, 81.75%
22. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-6 Grades in Literacy is
23. one of continuous growth.
24. Third Grade, the lowest trend area of concern is content. Fourth Grade, the
25. lowest trend area of concern is content and practical. Fifth Grade, the lowest
26. of trend area of concern is practical. Sixth Grade, the lowest trend area of
27. concern is content.
- 28.

29. 3. Economically Disadvantaged Population
30. Grades K-6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
31. 68.8%/78.2%/81.75%
32. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5  
Grades in Literacy is
33. one of continuous growth.
34. Third Grade, lowest trend area of concern is content.  
Fourth Grade, the lowest
35. trend area of concern is content. Fifth Grade the  
lowest trend area of concern
36. is practical. Sixth Grade, the lowest area of concern  
is content.
- 37.
38. 4. Students with Disabilities
39. Grades k-6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
40. 28.9%/25%/31%
41. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5  
Grades in Literacy is
42. one of continuous growth.
43. Third Grade, lowest trend area of concern is content.  
Fourth Grade, the lowest
44. trend area of concern is content. Fifth Grade, the  
lowest trend area of
45. concern is content. Sixth Grade, the lowest trend  
area of concern is content.
- 46.
47. Literacy Priority Trend Analysis
48. District Grades 9-12
- 49.
50. 1. Combined Population
51. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
52. 71.4/75/71.7
53. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the  
9-12 Grades in Literacy is
54. one of continuous growth. Literacy EOC, the lowest  
trend analysis for this
55. test is practical.
- 56.
57. 2. Caucasian Population
58. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
59. 70.7/74.2/70.7
60. . The three year AYP District trend analysis for the  
9-12 Grades in Literacy
61. is one of continuous growth.
62. Literacy EOC, the lowest trend analysis is practical.
- 63.
64. 3. Economically Disadvantaged Population
65. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
66. 66.7/63.4/65
67. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the  
9-12 Grades in Literacy
68. is one of continuous growth.
69. Literacy EOC, the lowest trend analysis for this test  
is practical.
- 70.
71. 4. Students With Disabilities

- 72. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
- 73. 17.1/24.1/14.7
- 74. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades in Literacy is
- 75. one of continuous growth.
- 76. Literacy EOC, the lowest trend analysis for this test is practical and content.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
- 80. Math Priority Trend Analysis
- 81. District Grades K-5
- 82.

1. Combined Population

Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
84/83.9/83.5

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement and Geometry. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry.

2. Caucasian Population

Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
84/83.7/83.5

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry.

3. Economically Disadvantaged Population

Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2090/2010/2011  
81.2/82.8/83.5

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry and measurement. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis

and lowest area of concern is measurement. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry.

4. Students With Disabilities  
Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
52.6/40.6/48

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is probability. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is probability.

Math Priority Trend Analysis  
District grades 9-12

1. Combined Population  
Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
74/70.8/72.3

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions. Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

2. Caucasian Population  
Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
74.3/70.5/72.5

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions. Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

3. Economically Disadvantaged Population  
Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
68.3/62.6/67

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions.

Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

4. Students With Disabilities  
 Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
 37.2/25.9/18.5

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades.

Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions.

Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

83. The district uses Title 1, Title 2A, Title 6 state, ALE, Professional Development and NSLA funds to supplement various instructional activities throughout the district by providing funds for professional development in areas of need, to purchase supplemental instructional materials, to support emphasis in areas of greatest academic concern, and Title 2A class size reduction funds in a high poverty school.

**Goal** All school district students assessed on grades 3,4,5,6,7,8 Benchmark Exams, 11th Grade Literacy Exam, and Algebra and Geometry End of Course Exams will score proficient or advanced. Ninety-five percent of the Combined Population students and each subgroup will be tested. The graduation rate and attendance rates for the schools will meet or exceed the State rate. The percent of students scoring proficient/advanced in the Combined Population and all subgroups will meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target.

**Benchmark** By the end of school year 2011-12, all elementary schools in the district will meet or exceed an AYP of 85.60 in Literacy and 85.00 in Mathematics. Each high school will meet or exceed the 2011-12 AYP of 83.88 in Literacy and 82.30 in Mathematics.

Intervention: Total Instructional Alignment				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds to hire a 1.0 FTE highly qualified Curriculum Coordinator for the district to implement total Instructional Alignment and facilitate coordination of curriculum and instruction through out the district. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds.	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$16,500.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$16,500.00

Action Type: Alignment				
Action Type: Collaboration				
Total Budget:				\$16,500.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$75000**

Priority 1: Administrative Support For Academic Achievement

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY: After analyzing our state assessment data, we looked
2. at collected data from classroom walkthroughs and our vertical and horizontal
3. alignment provided to us from The Learning Institute. We then made needed
4. adjustments to our curriculum as well and planned professional development for
5. identified areas specific to each building. The Jasper and Oak High Schools
6. are in year 1 school improvement.
- 7.
8. Literacy Priority Trend Analysis
9. District Grades K-6
10. 1. Combined Population- 2009-2010-2011
11. 73.4% - 79.9 - 82.3
12. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-6 Grades in Literacy is
13. one of continuous growth.
14. Third Grade, lowest trend area of concern is content. Fourth Grade the lowest
15. trend area of concern is content. Fifth Grade, the lowest trend area of
16. concern is practical. Sixth Grade the lowest trend area of concern is content.
- 17.
- 18.
19. 2. Caucasian Population 2009/2010/2011
20. Grades K-6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam
21. 73.6%, 79.7%, 81.75%
22. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-6 Grades in Literacy is
23. one of continuous growth.
24. Third Grade, the lowest trend area of concern is content. Fourth Grade, the
25. lowest trend area of concern is content and practical. Fifth Grade, the lowest
26. of trend area of concern is practical. Sixth Grade, the lowest trend area of
27. concern is content.
- 28.
29. 3. Economically Disadvantaged Population
30. Grades K-6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
31. 68.8%/78.2%/81.75%
32. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Literacy is
33. one of continuous growth.

Supporting Data:

34. Third Grade, lowest trend area of concern is content.  
Fourth Grade, the lowest
35. trend area of concern is content. Fifth Grade the  
lowest trend area of concern
36. is practical. Sixth Grade, the lowest area of concern  
is content.
- 37.
38. 4. Students with Disabilities
39. Grades k-6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
40. 28.9%/25%/31%
41. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5  
Grades in Literacy is
42. one of continuous growth.
43. Third Grade, lowest trend area of concern is content.  
Fourth Grade, the lowest
44. trend area of concern is content. Fifth Grade, the  
lowest trend area of
45. concern is content. Sixth Grade, the lowest trend  
area of concern is content.
- 46.
47. Literacy Priority Trend Analysis
48. District Grades 9-12
- 49.
50. 1. Combined Population
51. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
52. 71.4/75/71.7
53. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the  
9-12 Grades in Literacy is
54. one of continuous growth. Literacy EOC, the lowest  
trend analysis for this
55. test is practical.
- 56.
57. 2. Caucasian Population
58. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
59. 70.7/74.2/70.7
60. . The three year AYP District trend analysis for the  
9-12 Grades in Literacy
61. is one of continuous growth.
62. Literacy EOC, the lowest trend analysis is practical.
- 63.
64. 3. Economically Disadvantaged Population
65. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
66. 66.7/63.4/65
67. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the  
9-12 Grades in Literacy
68. is one of continuous growth.
69. Literacy EOC, the lowest trend analysis for this test  
is practical.
- 70.
71. 4. Students With Disabilities
72. Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011
73. 17.1/24.1/14.7
74. The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-  
12 Grades in Literacy is
75. one of continuous growth.

- 76. Literacy EOC, the lowest trend analysis for this test is practical and content.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
- 80. Math Priority Trend Analysis
- 81. District Grades K-5
- 82.

1. Combined Population  
Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
84/83.9/83.5  
The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement and Geometry. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry.

2. Caucasian Population  
Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
84/83.7/83.5  
The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry.

3. Economically Disadvantaged Population  
Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
81.2/82.8/83.5  
The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry and measurement. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is Geometry.

4. Students With Disabilities



Grades K-5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
52.6/40.6/48

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the K-5 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Third Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fourth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is measurement. Fifth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is probability. Sixth Grade, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is probability.

Math Priority Trend Analysis  
District grades 9-12

1. Combined Population  
Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
74/70.8/72.3

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions. Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

2. Caucasian Population  
Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
74.3/70.5/72.5

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions. Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

3. Economically Disadvantaged Population  
Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
68.3/62.6/67

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades in Mathematics is one of continuous growth. Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions. Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

4. Students With Disabilities  
Grades 9-12 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:2009/2010/2011  
37.2/25.9/18.5

The three year AYP District trend analysis for the 9-12 Grades.

Algebra EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is linear functions.

Geometry EOC, three year trend analysis and lowest area of concern is coordinate geometry and transformations.

83. The district uses Title 1, Title 2A, Title 6 state, ALE, Professional Development and NSLA funds to supplement various instructional activities throughout the district by providing funds for professional development in areas of need, to purchase supplemental instructional materials, to support emphasis in areas of greatest academic concern, and Title 2A class size reduction funds in a high poverty school.

**Goal** All school district students assessed on grades 3,4,5,6,7,8 Benchmark Exams, 11th Grade Literacy Exam, and Algebra and Geometry End of Course Exams will score proficient or advanced. Ninety-five percent of the Combined Population students and each subgroup will be tested. The graduation rate and attendance rates for the schools will meet or exceed the State rate. The percent of students scoring proficient/advanced in the Combined Population and all subgroups will meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target.

**Benchmark** By the end of school year 2011-12, all elementary schools in the district will meet or exceed an AYP of 85.60 in Literacy and 85.00 in Mathematics. Each high school will meet or exceed the 2011-12 AYP of 83.88 in Literacy and 82.30 in Mathematics.

Intervention: Total Instructional Alignment				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds to hire a 1.0 FTE highly qualified Curriculum Coordinator for the district to implement total Instructional Alignment and facilitate coordination of curriculum and instruction through out the district. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$75,000.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$75,000.00
Total Budget:				\$75,000.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$0**

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies".

---

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

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

---

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

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

---

**KINGSTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$73477**

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 -- \$7032**

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting  
Data:

1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. Both sub-groups scored at or above the combined population percentages.
2. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:
3. After studying literacy NRT (Reading Comprehension) for ITBS: data indicates
4. that kindergarten needs to improve on operational language, first grade needs
5. to improve on spelling consonants (blends) and second grade needs to improve on
6. vocabulary and story comprehension (inferences and interpretation/factual
7. understanding)
8. After studying data for CRT (ACTAAP) the results are:  
Fourth and fifth grades
9. need to improve in multiple choice writing. Sixth grade needs to improve in
10. multiple choice content passage. Grades fourth, fifth, and sixth need to
11. improve in open response content and style.
- 12.
- 13.
14. LITERACY:
15. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS
16. Grade 0:
17. 1. Combined Population:
18. Year: 2011~2010~2009
19. Number Tested: 17~27~25
20. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
21. Reading Comprehension: 77%~63%~52%
- 22.
23. 2. Caucasian Population:
24. Year: 2011~2010~2009
25. Number Tested: 16~25~25
26. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

27. Reading Comprehension: 75%~64%52%  
28.  
29. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
30. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
31. Number Tested: 17~20~21  
32. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
33. Reading Comprehension: 77%~50%~42%  
34.  
35. The weakest area in Kindergarten was in Operational Language.  
36.

37.  
38. LITERACY:  
39. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
40. Grade 1  
41. 1. Combined Population:  
42. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
43. Number Tested: 19~19~14  
44. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
45. Reading Comprehension: 90%~58%~86%  
46.  
47. 2. Caucasian Population:  
48. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
49. Number Tested: 18~19~13  
50. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
51. Reading Comprehension: 89%~57%~84%  
52.  
53. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
54. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
55. Number Tested: 15~15~10  
56. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
57. Reading Comprehension: 87%~53%~80%  
58. The weakest area in First grade was in Spelling Consonants (blends).  
59.

60.  
61. LITERACY:  
62. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
63. Grade 2:  
64. 1. Combined Population:  
65. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
66. Number Tested: 19~17~19  
67. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
68. Reading Comprehension: 53%~53%~53%  
69.  
70. 2. Caucasian Population:  
71. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
72. Number Tested: 18~15~19  
73. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
74. Reading Comprehension: 50%~53%~53%  
75.  
76. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
77. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
78. Number Tested: 16~13~11

79. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
80. Reading Comprehension: 50%~39%~64%  
81. The weak areas in Second grade are in vocabulary and  
story comprehension  
82. (inferences and interpretation/factual understanding).  
83.  
  
84.  
85.  
86.  
87. Literacy  
88.  
89. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
90. Reading Comprehension  
91. 1. Combined Population:  
92. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
93. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
94. In 2009, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
95.  
96.  
97. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
98. In 2011, 86% scored proficient or advanced.  
99. In 2010, 73% scored proficient or advanced.  
100. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
101.  
102. 3. Caucasian:  
103. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advance.  
104. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
105. In 2009, 76% scored proficient or advanced.  
106.  
107. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
108.  
109. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
110. 1. Combined Population: Grade 3  
111. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
112. Number Tested: 17~20~18  
113. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
114. Reading Comprehension: 47%~60%~44%  
115.  
116. 2. Caucasian Population:  
117. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
118. Number Tested: 16~20~17  
119. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
120. Reading Comprehension: 44%~60%~41%  
121.  
122. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
123. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
124. Number Tested: 14~11~8  
125. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
126. Reading Comprehension: 36%~72%~63%  
127.  
128. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
129.

130.  
131.  
132.  
133. Literacy Priority  
134. Reading Comprehension: Grade 4  
135. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
136. 1. Combined Population  
137. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.  
138. In 2010, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
139. In 2009, 82% scored proficient or advanced.  
140.  
141. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
142. In 2011, 92% scored proficient or advanced.  
143. In 2010, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
144. In 2009, 81% scored proficient or advanced.  
145.  
146. 3. Caucasian:  
147. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.  
148. In 2010, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
149. In 2009, 80% scored proficient or advanced.  
150. The weak areas in Fourth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
151.  
  
152.  
153. Grade 4:  
154. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
155. 1. Combined Population:  
156. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
157. Number Tested: 21~20~17  
158. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
159. Reading Comprehension: 67%~90%~65%  
160.  
161. 2. Caucasian Population:  
162. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
163. Number Tested: 20~19~15  
164. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
165. Reading Comprehension: 65%~89%~67%  
166.  
167. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
168. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
169. Number Tested: 13~13~11  
170. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
171. Reading Comprehension: 77%~85%~64%  
172.  
  
173.  
174.  
175.  
176. LITERACY PRIORITY:  
177. Reading Comprehension: Grade 5:  
178. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
179. 1. Combined Population  
180. In 2011, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
181. In 2010, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
182. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.

183.  
184. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
185. In 2011, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
186. In 2010, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
187. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
188.  
189. 3. Caucasian:  
190. In 2011, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
191. In 2010, 84% scored proficient or advanced.  
192. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
193.  
194. The weak areas in Fifth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
195.  
196.  
197. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
198. Grade 5:  
199. 1. Combined Population  
200. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
201. Number Tested: 21~16~14  
202. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
203. Reading Comprehension: 43%~69%~79%  
204.  
205. 2. Caucasian Population:  
206. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
207. Number Tested: 20~13~14  
208. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
209. Reading Comprehension: 45%~62%~79%  
210.  
211. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
212. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
213. Number Tested: 15~11~8  
214. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
215. Reading Comprehension: 33%~73%~63%  
216.  
  
217.  
218.  
219. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
220. Grade 6  
221. 1. Combined Population  
222. In 2011, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
223. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
224. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
225.  
226. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
227. In 2011, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
228. In 2010, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
229. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
230.  
231. 3. Caucasian:  
232. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
233. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
234. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
235.

- 236. The weak areas in Sixth grade are Reading (content passage)in MC and writing
- 237. (content and style) in Open response.
- 238.
- 239.
- 240. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS
- 241. Grade 6:
- 242. 1. Combined Population:
- 243. Year: 2011~2010~2009
- 244. Number Tested: 18~15~18
- 245. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
- 246. Reading Comprehension: 61%~60%~78%
- 247.
- 248. 2. Caucasian Population:
- 249. Year: 2011~2010~2009
- 250. Number Tested: 16~15~17
- 251. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
- 252. Reading Comprehension: 63%~60%~82%
- 253.
- 254. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:
- 255. Year: 2011~2010~2009
- 256. Number Tested: 14~9~8
- 257. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
- 258. Reading Comprehension: 64%~56%~75%
- 259.
- 260.
- 261.
- 262. Attendance Rate:
- 263. 2008: 95.2%
- 264. 2009: 94.4%
- 265. 2010: 94.4%
- 266.
- 267.
- 268.
- 269.
- 270.
- 271.
- 272.
- 273.

**Goal** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

**Benchmark** In 2012, all student groups are expected to meet or exceed the AYP target of 85.60, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth Provision. All student groups meet or exceeded the AYP target score in 2011, 2010, and 2009.

**Intervention:** The staff at Kingston Elementary School will read and implement Common Core State Standards for literacy.

**Scientific Based Research:** This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
---------	--------------------	----------	-----------	-----------------



Setting aside funds to purchase a set of 11 Apple I Pads, protective covers, charging station chart docking computer and student applications (apps), and protective insurance to address the areas of content and style, multiple choice writing, and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages. Teachers will evaluate the effectiveness by assigning projects that align with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will also evaluate using TLI module tests to determine if students are reaching those objectives. This program is supplemental to other programs provided for with local funds. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Marsha Shaver	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$7,032.00  <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$7,032.00
Total Budget:				\$7,032.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$13285**

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. Both sub-groups scored at or above the combined population percentages.
2. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:
3. After studying literacy NRT (Reading Comprehension) for ITBS: data indicates
4. that kindergarten needs to improve on operational language, first grade needs
5. to improve on spelling consonants (blends) and second grade needs to improve on
6. vocabulary and story comprehension (inferences and interpretation/factual
7. understanding)
8. After studying data for CRT (ACTAAP) the results are: Fourth and fifth grades
9. need to improve in multiple choice writing. Sixth grade needs to improve in
10. multiple choice content passage. Grades fourth, fifth, and sixth need to
11. improve in open response content and style.
- 12.
- 13.
14. LITERACY:
15. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS
16. Grade 0:
17. 1. Combined Population:
18. Year: 2011~2010~2009
19. Number Tested: 17~27~25
20. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
21. Reading Comprehension: 77%~63%~52%
- 22.
23. 2. Caucasian Population:

24. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
25. Number Tested:16~25~25  
26. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
27. Reading Comprehension: 75%~64%52%  
28.  
29. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
30. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
31. Number Tested: 17~20~21  
32. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
33. Reading Comprehension: 77%~50%~42%  
34.  
35. The weakest area in Kindergarten was in Operational  
Language.  
36.  
37.  
38. LITERACY:  
39. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
40. Grade 1  
41. 1. Combined Population:  
42. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
43. Number Tested: 19~19~14  
44. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
45. Reading Comprehension: 90%~58%~86%  
46.  
47. 2. Caucasian Population:  
48. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
49. Number Tested: 18~19~13  
50. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
51. Reading Comprehension: 89%~57%~84%  
52.  
53. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
54. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
55. Number Tested: 15~15~10  
56. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
57. Reading Comprehension: 87%~53%~80%  
58. The weakest area in First grade was in Spelling  
Consonants (blends).  
59.  
60.  
61. LITERACY:  
62. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
63. Grade 2:  
64. 1. Combined Population:  
65. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
66. Number Tested: 19~17~19  
67. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
68. Reading Comprehension: 53%~53%~53%  
69.  
70. 2. Caucasian Population:  
71. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
72. Number Tested: 18~15~19  
73. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
74. Reading Comprehension: 50%~53%~53%  
75.

76. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
77. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
78. Number Tested: 16~13~11  
79. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
80. Reading Comprehension: 50%~39%~64%  
81. The weak areas in Second grade are in vocabulary and  
story comprehension  
82. (inferences and interpretation/factual understanding).  
83.  
  
84.  
85.  
86.  
87. Literacy  
88.  
89. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
90. Reading Comprehension  
91. 1. Combined Population:  
92. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
93. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
94. In 2009, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
95.  
96.  
97. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
98. In 2011, 86% scored proficient or advanced.  
99. In 2010, 73% scored proficient or advanced.  
100. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
101.  
102. 3. Caucasian:  
103. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advance.  
104. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
105. In 2009, 76% scored proficient or advanced.  
106.  
107. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
108.  
109. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
110. 1. Combined Population: Grade 3  
111. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
112. Number Tested: 17~20~18  
113. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
114. Reading Comprehension: 47%~60%~44%  
115.  
116. 2. Caucasian Population:  
117. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
118. Number Tested: 16~20~17  
119. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
120. Reading Comprehension: 44%~60%~41%  
121.  
122. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
123. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
124. Number Tested: 14~11~8  
125. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
126. Reading Comprehension: 36%~72%~63%  
127.

128. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and Writing content and style.

129.

130.

131.

132.

133. Literacy Priority

134. Reading Comprehension: Grade 4

135. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

136. 1. Combined Population

137. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.

138. In 2010, 90% scored proficient or advanced.

139. In 2009, 82% scored proficient or advanced.

140.

141. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):

142. In 2011, 92% scored proficient or advanced.

143. In 2010, 93% scored proficient or advanced.

144. In 2009, 81% scored proficient or advanced.

145.

146. 3. Caucasian:

147. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.

148. In 2010, 89% scored proficient or advanced.

149. In 2009, 80% scored proficient or advanced.

150. The weak areas in Fourth grade are writing (MC) and Writing content and style.

151.

152.

153. Grade 4:

154. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS

155. 1. Combined Population:

156. Year: 2011~2010~2009

157. Number Tested: 21~20~17

158. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

159. Reading Comprehension: 67%~90%~65%

160.

161. 2. Caucasian Population:

162. Year: 2011~2010~2009

163. Number Tested: 20~19~15

164. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

165. Reading Comprehension: 65%~89%~67%

166.

167. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

168. Year: 2011~2010~2009

169. Number Tested: 13~13~11

170. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

171. Reading Comprehension: 77%~85%~64%

172.

173.

174.

175.

176. LITERACY PRIORITY:

177. Reading Comprehension: Grade 5:

178. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

179. 1. Combined Population  
180. In 2011, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
181. In 2010, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
182. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
183.  
184. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
185. In 2011, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
186. In 2010, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
187. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
188.  
189. 3. Caucasian:  
190. In 2011, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
191. In 2010, 84% scored proficient or advanced.  
192. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
193.  
194. The weak areas in Fifth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
195.  
196.  
197. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
198. Grade 5:  
199. 1. Combined Population  
200. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
201. Number Tested: 21~16~14  
202. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
203. Reading Comprehension: 43%~69%~79%  
204.  
205. 2. Caucasian Population:  
206. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
207. Number Tested: 20~13~14  
208. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
209. Reading Comprehension: 45%~62%~79%  
210.  
211. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
212. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
213. Number Tested: 15~11~8  
214. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
215. Reading Comprehension: 33%~73%~63%  
216.  
  
217.  
218.  
219. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
220. Grade 6  
221. 1. Combined Population  
222. In 2011, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
223. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
224. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
225.  
226. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
227. In 2011, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
228. In 2010, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
229. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
230.  
231. 3. Caucasian:  
232. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.

- 233. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.
- 234. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.
- 235.
- 236. The weak areas in Sixth grade are Reading (content passage) in MC and writing
- 237. (content and style) in Open response.
- 238.
  
- 239.
- 240. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS
- 241. Grade 6:
- 242. 1. Combined Population:
- 243. Year: 2011~2010~2009
- 244. Number Tested: 18~15~18
- 245. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
- 246. Reading Comprehension: 61%~60%~78%
- 247.
- 248. 2. Caucasian Population:
- 249. Year: 2011~2010~2009
- 250. Number Tested: 16~15~17
- 251. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
- 252. Reading Comprehension: 63%~60%~82%
- 253.
- 254. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:
- 255. Year: 2011~2010~2009
- 256. Number Tested: 14~9~8
- 257. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
- 258. Reading Comprehension: 64%~56%~75%
- 259.
  
- 260.
- 261.
- 262. Attendance Rate:
- 263. 2008: 95.2%
- 264. 2009: 94.4%
- 265. 2010: 94.4%
- 266.
- 267.
- 268.
- 269.
- 270.
- 271.
- 272.
- 273.

Goal The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

Benchmark In 2012, all student groups are expected to meet or exceed the AYP target of 85.60, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth Provision. All student groups meet or exceeded the AYP target score in 2011, 2010, and 2009.

Intervention: The staff at Kingston Elementary School will read and implement Common Core State Standards for literacy.

Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
EQUITY: Hire .325 FTE highly qualified Elementary Counselor to supplement required 1.00 counseling position. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$4,000.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$4,000.00
Setting aside funds to hire a .50 fte instructional aide in the areas of math and literacy. This program is supplemental to programs already offered with local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity	Marsha Shaver	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - \$2,910.00 Employee Benefits: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,910.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$6,910.00</b>

Priority 3: Wellness

1. 1. Kingston Elementary Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of students who may be at risk of poor academic performance based on BMI.
2. Body Mass Data:
3. 2010-11:
4. 44 Males: 68.2% Healthy or Underweight~~31.8% overweight or obese.
- 5.
6. 47 Females: 57.4% Healthy or Underweight~~42.6% overweight or obese.
- 7.
8. 2009-10:
9. 24 Males: 70.8% Healthy or Underweight~~and 29.2% Overweight or Obese.
- 10.
11. 24 Females: 70% Healthy or Underweight and 30% Overweight Or Obese.
- 12.
13. 2008-09:
14. 40 Males: 75% Healthy or Underweight~~25% Overweight or Obese
15. 48 Females:60% Healthy or Underweight~~39.6% Overweight Or Obese.
- 16.
17. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 139 student population, 54 students were
18. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of

Supporting Data:

19. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
20. Elementary: Males-44.0%, Females-41.4%;
- 21.
- 22.
- 23.
- 24.
- 25.
26. School Health Index
27. 2010-11: The SHI was not performed. No data results.
- 28.
29. Overall Score Card
30. For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score falls.
31. falls.
32. Low 0-20%, 21-40%; Medium 41-60%, 61-80%;
33. High 81-100%
- 34.
35. School Health Policies and Environment -
36. Module 1 - REQUIRED 84%
37. Health Education -
38. Module 2 - REQUIRED 50%
39. Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - Module 3 - REQUIRED
40. 38%
41. Nutrition Services -
42. Module 4 - REQUIRED 71%
43. School Health Services -
44. Module 5 - OPTIONAL
45. School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service - Module 6 - OPTIONAL
- 46.
47. Health Promotion for Staff -
48. Module 7 - OPTIONAL
49. Family and Community Involvement - Module 8 - REQUIRED 11%
- 50.
- 51.
- 52.
53. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2010-11: 67% combined
54. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2009-10:
55. Elementary, 33% Paid, 15% Reduced, and 52% Free.
56. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2008-09:
57. Elementary, 40% Paid, 5% Reduced, and 55% Free.
- 58.
59. Has increased by 7% in the last 3 years.
- 60.
61. Madison County Unemployment Rate:
62. Dec. 2010--6.8%
63. Dec. 2009--6.4%
64. Dec. 2008--5.3%
- 65.
66. Has increased 1.5% in the last 3 years.
- 67.
- 68.
- 69.



- 70.
- 71.
- 72.
- 73.
- 74.
- 75.
- 76.
- 77.
- 78.

Goal Kingston Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Benchmark At the end of the 2011-12 school year, 20 percent of the students will have decreased his/her BMI.

Intervention: The School nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, education Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE School nurse to supplement required district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$6,375.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,375.00
Total Budget:				\$6,375.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$44585**

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. Both sub-groups scored at or above the combined population percentages.
2. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:
3. After studying literacy NRT (Reading Comprehension) for ITBS: data indicates
4. that kindergarten needs to improve on operational language, first grade needs
5. to improve on spelling consonants (blends) and second grade needs to improve on
6. vocabulary and story comprehension (inferences and interpretation/factual
7. understanding)
8. After studying data for CRT (ACTAAP) the results are: Fourth and fifth grades
9. need to improve in multiple choice writing. Sixth grade needs to improve in
10. multiple choice content passage. Grades fourth, fifth, and sixth need to
11. improve in open response content and style.

12.  
13.  
14. LITERACY:  
15. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
16. Grade 0:  
17. 1. Combined Population:  
18. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
19. Number Tested:17~27~25  
20. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
21. Reading Comprehension: 77%~63%~52%  
22.  
23. 2. Caucasian Population:  
24. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
25. Number Tested:16~25~25  
26. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
27. Reading Comprehension: 75%~64%~52%  
28.  
29. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
30. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
31. Number Tested: 17~20~21  
32. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
33. Reading Comprehension: 77%~50%~42%  
34.  
35. The weakest area in Kindergarten was in Operational  
Language.  
36.

37.  
38. LITERACY:  
39. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
40. Grade 1  
41. 1. Combined Population:  
42. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
43. Number Tested: 19~19~14  
44. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
45. Reading Comprehension: 90%~58%~86%  
46.  
47. 2. Caucasian Population:  
48. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
49. Number Tested: 18~19~13  
50. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
51. Reading Comprehension: 89%~57%~84%  
52.  
53. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
54. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
55. Number Tested: 15~15~10  
56. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
57. Reading Comprehension: 87%~53%~80%  
58. The weakest area in First grade was in Spelling  
Consonants (blends).  
59.

60.  
61. LITERACY:  
62. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
63. Grade 2:

64. 1. Combined Population:  
65. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
66. Number Tested: 19~17~19  
67. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
68. Reading Comprehension: 53%~53%~53%  
69.  
70. 2. Caucasian Population:  
71. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
72. Number Tested: 18~15~19  
73. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
74. Reading Comprehension: 50%~53%~53%  
75.  
76. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
77. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
78. Number Tested: 16~13~11  
79. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
80. Reading Comprehension: 50%~39%~64%  
81. The weak areas in Second grade are in vocabulary and  
story comprehension  
82. (inferences and interpretation/factual understanding).  
83.  
  
84.  
85.  
86.  
87. Literacy  
88.  
89. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
90. Reading Comprehension  
91. 1. Combined Population:  
92. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
93. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
94. In 2009, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
95.  
96.  
97. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
98. In 2011, 86% scored proficient or advanced.  
99. In 2010, 73% scored proficient or advanced.  
100. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
101.  
102. 3. Caucasian:  
103. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advance.  
104. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
105. In 2009, 76% scored proficient or advanced.  
106.  
107. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
108.  
109. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
110. 1. Combined Population: Grade 3  
111. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
112. Number Tested: 17~20~18  
113. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
114. Reading Comprehension: 47%~60%~44%  
115.  
116. 2. Caucasian Population:

117. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
118. Number Tested: 16~20~17  
119. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
120. Reading Comprehension: 44%~60%~41%  
121.  
122. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
123. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
124. Number Tested: 14~11~8  
125. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
126. Reading Comprehension: 36%~72%~63%  
127.  
128. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
129.  
  
130.  
131.  
132.  
133. Literacy Priority  
134. Reading Comprehension: Grade 4  
135. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
136. 1. Combined Population  
137. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.  
138. In 2010, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
139. In 2009, 82% scored proficient or advanced.  
140.  
141. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
142. In 2011, 92% scored proficient or advanced.  
143. In 2010, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
144. In 2009, 81% scored proficient or advanced.  
145.  
146. 3. Caucasian:  
147. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.  
148. In 2010, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
149. In 2009, 80% scored proficient or advanced.  
150. The weak areas in Fourth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
151.  
  
152.  
153. Grade 4:  
154. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
155. 1. Combined Population:  
156. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
157. Number Tested: 21~20~17  
158. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
159. Reading Comprehension: 67%~90%~65%  
160.  
161. 2. Caucasian Population:  
162. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
163. Number Tested: 20~19~15  
164. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
165. Reading Comprehension: 65%~89%~67%  
166.  
167. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
168. Year: 2011~2010~2009

169. Number Tested: 13~13~11  
170. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
171. Reading Comprehension: 77%~85%~64%  
172.  
  
173.  
174.  
175.  
176. LITERACY PRIORITY:  
177. Reading Comprehension: Grade 5:  
178. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
179. 1. Combined Population  
180. In 2011, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
181. In 2010, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
182. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
183.  
184. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
185. In 2011, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
186. In 2010, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
187. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
188.  
189. 3. Caucasian:  
190. In 2011, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
191. In 2010, 84% scored proficient or advanced.  
192. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
193.  
194. The weak areas in Fifth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
195.  
196.  
197. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
198. Grade 5:  
199. 1. Combined Population  
200. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
201. Number Tested: 21~16~14  
202. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
203. Reading Comprehension: 43%~69%~79%  
204.  
205. 2. Caucasian Population:  
206. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
207. Number Tested: 20~13~14  
208. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
209. Reading Comprehension: 45%~62%~79%  
210.  
211. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
212. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
213. Number Tested: 15~11~8  
214. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
215. Reading Comprehension: 33%~73%~63%  
216.  
  
217.  
218.  
219. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
220. Grade 6  
221. 1. Combined Population

222. In 2011, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
223. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
224. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
225.  
226. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
227. In 2011, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
228. In 2010, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
229. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
230.  
231. 3. Caucasian:  
232. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
233. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
234. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
235.  
236. The weak areas in Sixth grade are Reading (content passage) in MC and writing  
237. (content and style) in Open response.  
238.  
  
239.  
240. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
241. Grade 6:  
242. 1. Combined Population:  
243. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
244. Number Tested: 18~15~18  
245. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
246. Reading Comprehension: 61%~60%~78%  
247.  
248. 2. Caucasian Population:  
249. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
250. Number Tested: 16~15~17  
251. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
252. Reading Comprehension: 63%~60%~82%  
253.  
254. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
255. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
256. Number Tested: 14~9~8  
257. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
258. Reading Comprehension: 64%~56%~75%  
259.  
  
260.  
261.  
262. Attendance Rate:  
263. 2008: 95.2%  
264. 2009: 94.4%  
265. 2010: 94.4%  
266.  
267.  
268.  
269.  
270.  
271.  
272.  
273.

Goal The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

Benchmark In 2012, all student groups are expected to meet or exceed the AYP target of 85.60, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth Provision. All student groups meet or exceeded the AYP target score in 2011, 2010, and 2009.

Intervention: The staff at Kingston Elementary School will read and implement Common Core State Standards for literacy.				
Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
EQUITY: Hire .325 FTE highly qualified Elementary Counselor to supplement required 1.00 counseling position. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$15,000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$15,000.00
Setting aside funds to hire a .50 fte instructional aide in the areas of math and literacy. This program is supplemental to programs already offered with local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity	Marsha Shaver	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$9,660.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$9,660.00
Total Budget:				\$24,660.00

Priority 3: Wellness

1. 1. Kingston Elementary Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of students who may be at risk of poor academic performance based on BMI.
2. Body Mass Data:
3. 2010-11:
4. 44 Males: 68.2% Healthy or Underweight~~31.8% overweight or obese.
- 5.
6. 47 Females: 57.4% Healthy or Underweight~~42.6% overweight or obese.
- 7.
8. 2009-10:
9. 24 Males: 70.8% Healthy or Underweight~~and 29.2% Overweight or Obese.
- 10.
11. 24 Females: 70% Healthy or Underweight and 30% Overweight Or Obese.
- 12.

Supporting Data:

13. 2008-09:
14. 40 Males: 75% Healthy or Underweight~~25% Overweight or Obese
15. 48 Females:60% Healthy or Underweight~~39.6% Overweight Or Obese.
- 16.
17. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 139 student population, 54 students were
18. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of
19. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
20. Elementary: Males-44.0%, Females-41.4%;
- 21.
- 22.
- 23.
- 24.
- 25.
26. School Health Index
27. 2010-11: The SHI was not performed. No data results.
- 28.
29. Overall Score Card
30. For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score
31. falls.
32. Low 0-20%, 21-40%; Medium 41-60%, 61-80%;
33. High 81-100%
- 34.
35. School Health Policies and Environment -
36. Module 1 - REQUIRED 84%
37. Health Education -
38. Module 2 - REQUIRED 50%
39. Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - Module 3 - REQUIRED
40. 38%
41. Nutrition Services -
42. Module 4 - REQUIRED 71%
43. School Health Services -
44. Module 5 - OPTIONAL
45. School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service - Module 6 - OPTIONAL
- 46.
47. Health Promotion for Staff -
48. Module 7 - OPTIONAL
49. Family and Community Involvement - Module 8 - REQUIRED 11%
- 50.
- 51.
- 52.
53. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2010-11: 67% combined
54. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2009-10:
55. Elementary, 33% Paid, 15% Reduced, and 52% Free.
56. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2008-09:
57. Elementary, 40% Paid, 5% Reduced, and 55% Free.
- 58.
59. Has increased by 7% in the last 3 years.



- 60.
- 61. Madison County Unemployment Rate:
- 62. Dec. 2010--6.8%
- 63. Dec. 2009--6.4%
- 64. Dec. 2008--5.3%
- 65.
- 66. Has increased 1.5% in the last 3 years.
- 67.
- 68.
- 69.
- 70.
- 71.
- 72.
- 73.
- 74.
- 75.
- 76.
- 77.
- 78.

**Goal** Kingston Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

**Benchmark** At the end of the 2011-12 school year, 20 percent of the students will have decreased his/her BMI.

Intervention: The School nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, education Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE School nurse to supplement required district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$19,925.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$19,925.00
Total Budget:				\$19,925.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. Both sub-groups scored at or above the combined population percentages.
2. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:
3. After studying literacy NRT (Reading Comprehension) for ITBS: data indicates
4. that kindergarten needs to improve on operational language, first grade needs
5. to improve on spelling consonants(blends) and second grade needs to improve on
6. vocabulary and story comprehension (inferences and interpretation/factual

**Supporting Data:**

7. understanding)
8. After studying data for CRT (ACTAAP) the results are:  
Fourth and fifth grades
9. need to improve in multiple choice writing. Sixth grade  
needs to improve in
10. multiple choice content passage. Grades fourth, fifth,  
and sixth need to
11. improve in open response content and style.
- 12.
- 13.
14. LITERACY:
15. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS
16. Grade 0:
17. 1. Combined Population:
18. Year: 2011~2010~2009
19. Number Tested:17~27~25
20. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
21. Reading Comprehension: 77%~63%~52%
- 22.
23. 2. Caucasian Population:
24. Year: 2011~2010~2009
25. Number Tested:16~25~25
26. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
27. Reading Comprehension: 75%~64%~52%
- 28.
29. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:
30. Year: 2011~2010~2009
31. Number Tested: 17~20~21
32. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
33. Reading Comprehension: 77%~50%~42%
- 34.
35. The weakest area in Kindergarten was in Operational  
Language.
- 36.
- 37.
38. LITERACY:
39. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS
40. Grade 1
41. 1. Combined Population:
42. Year: 2011~2010~2009
43. Number Tested: 19~19~14
44. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
45. Reading Comprehension: 90%~58%~86%
- 46.
47. 2. Caucasian Population:
48. Year: 2011~2010~2009
49. Number Tested: 18~19~13
50. %At/Above 50th NPR in:
51. Reading Comprehension: 89%~57%~84%
- 52.
53. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:
54. Year: 2011~2010~2009
55. Number Tested: 15~15~10

56. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
57. Reading Comprehension: 87%~53%~80%  
58. The weakest area in First grade was in Spelling  
Consonants (blends).  
59.  
60.  
61. LITERACY:  
62. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
63. Grade 2:  
64. 1. Combined Population:  
65. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
66. Number Tested: 19~17~19  
67. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
68. Reading Comprehension: 53%~53%~53%  
69.  
70. 2. Caucasian Population:  
71. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
72. Number Tested: 18~15~19  
73. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
74. Reading Comprehension: 50%~53%~53%  
75.  
76. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
77. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
78. Number Tested: 16~13~11  
79. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
80. Reading Comprehension: 50%~39%~64%  
81. The weak areas in Second grade are in vocabulary and  
story comprehension  
82. (inferences and interpretation/factual understanding).  
83.  
84.  
85.  
86.  
87. Literacy  
88.  
89. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
90. Reading Comprehension  
91. 1. Combined Population:  
92. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
93. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
94. In 2009, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
95.  
96.  
97. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
98. In 2011, 86% scored proficient or advanced.  
99. In 2010, 73% scored proficient or advanced.  
100. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
101.  
102. 3. Caucasian:  
103. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advance.  
104. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.  
105. In 2009, 76% scored proficient or advanced.  
106.

107. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and Writing content and style.

108.

109. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS

110. 1. Combined Population: Grade 3

111. Year: 2011~2010~2009

112. Number Tested: 17~20~18

113. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

114. Reading Comprehension: 47%~60%~44%

115.

116. 2. Caucasian Population:

117. Year: 2011~2010~2009

118. Number Tested: 16~20~17

119. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

120. Reading Comprehension: 44%~60%~41%

121.

122. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

123. Year: 2011~2010~2009

124. Number Tested: 14~11~8

125. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

126. Reading Comprehension: 36%~72%~63%

127.

128. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and Writing content and style.

129.

130.

131.

132.

133. Literacy Priority

134. Reading Comprehension: Grade 4

135. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

136. 1. Combined Population

137. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.

138. In 2010, 90% scored proficient or advanced.

139. In 2009, 82% scored proficient or advanced.

140.

141. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):

142. In 2011, 92% scored proficient or advanced.

143. In 2010, 93% scored proficient or advanced.

144. In 2009, 81% scored proficient or advanced.

145.

146. 3. Caucasian:

147. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.

148. In 2010, 89% scored proficient or advanced.

149. In 2009, 80% scored proficient or advanced.

150. The weak areas in Fourth grade are writing (MC) and Writing content and style.

151.

152.

153. Grade 4:

154. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS

155. 1. Combined Population:

156. Year: 2011~2010~2009

157. Number Tested: 21~20~17

158. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
159. Reading Comprehension: 67%~90%~65%  
160.  
161. 2. Caucasian Population:  
162. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
163. Number Tested: 20~19~15  
164. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
165. Reading Comprehension: 65%~89%~67%  
166.  
167. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
168. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
169. Number Tested: 13~13~11  
170. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
171. Reading Comprehension: 77%~85%~64%  
172.  
  
173.  
174.  
175.  
176. LITERACY PRIORITY:  
177. Reading Comprehension: Grade 5:  
178. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
179. 1. Combined Population  
180. In 2011, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
181. In 2010, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
182. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
183.  
184. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
185. In 2011, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
186. In 2010, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
187. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
188.  
189. 3. Caucasian:  
190. In 2011, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
191. In 2010, 84% scored proficient or advanced.  
192. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
193.  
194. The weak areas in Fifth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
195.  
196.  
197. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
198. Grade 5:  
199. 1. Combined Population  
200. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
201. Number Tested: 21~16~14  
202. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
203. Reading Comprehension: 43%~69%~79%  
204.  
205. 2. Caucasian Population:  
206. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
207. Number Tested: 20~13~14  
208. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
209. Reading Comprehension: 45%~62%~79%  
210.  
211. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

212. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
213. Number Tested: 15~11~8  
214. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
215. Reading Comprehension: 33%~73%~63%  
216.  
  
217.  
218.  
219. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
220. Grade 6  
221. 1. Combined Population  
222. In 2011, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
223. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
224. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
225.  
226. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
227. In 2011, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
228. In 2010, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
229. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
230.  
231. 3. Caucasian:  
232. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
233. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
234. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
235.  
236. The weak areas in Sixth grade are Reading (content  
passage)in MC and writing  
237. (content and style) in Open response.  
238.  
  
239.  
240. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
241. Grade 6:  
242. 1. Combined Population:  
243. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
244. Number Tested: 18~15~18  
245. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
246. Reading Comprehension: 61%~60%~78%  
247.  
248. 2. Caucasian Population:  
249. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
250. Number Tested: 16~15~17  
251. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
252. Reading Comprehension: 63%~60%~82%  
253.  
254. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
255. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
256. Number Tested: 14~9~8  
257. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
258. Reading Comprehension: 64%~56%~75%  
259.  
  
260.  
261.  
262. Attendance Rate:  
263. 2008: 95.2%

- 264. 2009: 94.4%
- 265. 2010: 94.4%
- 266.
- 267.
- 268.
- 269.
- 270.
- 271.
- 272.
- 273.

**Goal** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

**Benchmark** In 2012, all student groups are expected to meet or exceed the AYP target of 85.60, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth Provision. All student groups meet or exceeded the AYP target score in 2011, 2010, and 2009.

Intervention: The staff at Kingston Elementary School will read and implement Common Core State Standards for literacy.				
Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of supplemental reading materials. Items such as but not limited to books, magazines, or newspapers. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$2,859.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,859.00
Total Budget:				\$2,859.00

**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 -- \$5716**

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. Both sub-groups scored at or above the combined population percentages.
2. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:
3. After studying literacy NRT (Reading Comprehension) for ITBS: data indicates
4. that kindergarten needs to improve on operational language, first grade needs
5. to improve on spelling consonants (blends) and second grade needs to improve on
6. vocabulary and story comprehension (inferences and interpretation/factual
7. understanding)

8. After studying data for CRT (ACTAAP) the results are:  
Fourth and fifth grades
9. need to improve in multiple choice writing. Sixth grade needs to improve in
10. multiple choice content passage. Grades fourth, fifth, and sixth need to
11. improve in open response content and style.

12.

13.

14. LITERACY:

15. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS

16. Grade 0:

17. 1. Combined Population:

18. Year: 2011~2010~2009

19. Number Tested:17~27~25

20. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

21. Reading Comprehension: 77%~63%~52%

22.

23. 2. Caucasian Population:

24. Year: 2011~2010~2009

25. Number Tested:16~25~25

26. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

27. Reading Comprehension: 75%~64%~52%

28.

29. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

30. Year: 2011~2010~2009

31. Number Tested: 17~20~21

32. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

33. Reading Comprehension: 77%~50%~42%

34.

35. The weakest area in Kindergarten was in Operational Language.

36.

37.

38. LITERACY:

39. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS

40. Grade 1

41. 1. Combined Population:

42. Year: 2011~2010~2009

43. Number Tested: 19~19~14

44. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

45. Reading Comprehension: 90%~58%~86%

46.

47. 2. Caucasian Population:

48. Year: 2011~2010~2009

49. Number Tested: 18~19~13

50. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

51. Reading Comprehension: 89%~57%~84%

52.

53. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

54. Year: 2011~2010~2009

55. Number Tested: 15~15~10

56. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

57. Reading Comprehension: 87%~53%~80%



58. The weakest area in First grade was in Spelling  
Consonants (blends).

59.

60.

61. LITERACY:

62. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS

63. Grade 2:

64. 1. Combined Population:

65. Year: 2011~2010~2009

66. Number Tested: 19~17~19

67. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

68. Reading Comprehension: 53%~53%~53%

69.

70. 2. Caucasian Population:

71. Year: 2011~2010~2009

72. Number Tested: 18~15~19

73. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

74. Reading Comprehension: 50%~53%~53%

75.

76. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

77. Year: 2011~2010~2009

78. Number Tested: 16~13~11

79. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

80. Reading Comprehension: 50%~39%~64%

81. The weak areas in Second grade are in vocabulary and  
story comprehension

82. (inferences and interpretation/factual understanding).

83.

84.

85.

86.

87. Literacy

88.

89. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

90. Reading Comprehension

91. 1. Combined Population:

92. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.

93. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.

94. In 2009, 78% scored proficient or advanced.

95.

96.

97. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):

98. In 2011, 86% scored proficient or advanced.

99. In 2010, 73% scored proficient or advanced.

100. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.

101.

102. 3. Caucasian:

103. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advance.

104. In 2010, 75% scored proficient or advanced.

105. In 2009, 76% scored proficient or advanced.

106.

107. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.

108.

109. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
110. 1. Combined Population: Grade 3  
111. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
112. Number Tested: 17~20~18  
113. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
114. Reading Comprehension: 47%~60%~44%  
115.  
116. 2. Caucasian Population:  
117. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
118. Number Tested: 16~20~17  
119. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
120. Reading Comprehension: 44%~60%~41%  
121.  
122. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
123. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
124. Number Tested: 14~11~8  
125. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
126. Reading Comprehension: 36%~72%~63%  
127.  
128. The weak areas in Third grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
129.  
  
130.  
131.  
132.  
133. Literacy Priority  
134. Reading Comprehension: Grade 4  
135. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
136. 1. Combined Population  
137. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.  
138. In 2010, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
139. In 2009, 82% scored proficient or advanced.  
140.  
141. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
142. In 2011, 92% scored proficient or advanced.  
143. In 2010, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
144. In 2009, 81% scored proficient or advanced.  
145.  
146. 3. Caucasian:  
147. In 2011, 95% scored proficient or advanced.  
148. In 2010, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
149. In 2009, 80% scored proficient or advanced.  
150. The weak areas in Fourth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
151.  
  
152.  
153. Grade 4:  
154. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
155. 1. Combined Population:  
156. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
157. Number Tested: 21~20~17  
158. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
159. Reading Comprehension: 67%~90%~65%  
160.

161. 2. Caucasian Population:  
162. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
163. Number Tested: 20~19~15  
164. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
165. Reading Comprehension: 65%~89%~67%  
166.  
167. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
168. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
169. Number Tested: 13~13~11  
170. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
171. Reading Comprehension: 77%~85%~64%  
172.  
  
173.  
174.  
175.  
176. LITERACY PRIORITY:  
177. Reading Comprehension: Grade 5:  
178. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
179. 1. Combined Population  
180. In 2011, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
181. In 2010, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
182. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
183.  
184. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
185. In 2011, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
186. In 2010, 91% scored proficient or advanced.  
187. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
188.  
189. 3. Caucasian:  
190. In 2011, 90% scored proficient or advanced.  
191. In 2010, 84% scored proficient or advanced.  
192. In 2009, 85% scored proficient or advanced.  
193.  
194. The weak areas in Fifth grade are writing (MC) and  
Writing content and style.  
195.  
196.  
197. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
198. Grade 5:  
199. 1. Combined Population  
200. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
201. Number Tested: 21~16~14  
202. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
203. Reading Comprehension: 43%~69%~79%  
204.  
205. 2. Caucasian Population:  
206. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
207. Number Tested: 20~13~14  
208. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
209. Reading Comprehension: 45%~62%~79%  
210.  
211. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
212. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
213. Number Tested: 15~11~8  
214. %At/Above 50th NPR in:

215. Reading Comprehension: 33%~73%~63%  
216.  
  
217.  
218.  
219. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
220. Grade 6  
221. 1. Combined Population  
222. In 2011, 89% scored proficient or advanced.  
223. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
224. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
225.  
226. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
227. In 2011, 93% scored proficient or advanced.  
228. In 2010, 78% scored proficient or advanced.  
229. In 2009, there were fewer than "10" students tested.  
230.  
231. 3. Caucasian:  
232. In 2011, 88% scored proficient or advanced.  
233. In 2010, 87% scored proficient or advanced.  
234. In 2009, 94% scored proficient or advanced.  
235.  
236. The weak areas in Sixth grade are Reading (content  
passage) in MC and writing  
237. (content and style) in Open response.  
238.  
  
239.  
240. Normed Referenced Test: ITBS  
241. Grade 6:  
242. 1. Combined Population:  
243. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
244. Number Tested: 18~15~18  
245. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
246. Reading Comprehension: 61%~60%~78%  
247.  
248. 2. Caucasian Population:  
249. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
250. Number Tested: 16~15~17  
251. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
252. Reading Comprehension: 63%~60%~82%  
253.  
254. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
255. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
256. Number Tested: 14~9~8  
257. %At/Above 50th NPR in:  
258. Reading Comprehension: 64%~56%~75%  
259.  
  
260.  
261.  
262. Attendance Rate:  
263. 2008: 95.2%  
264. 2009: 94.4%  
265. 2010: 94.4%  
266.

- 267.
- 268.
- 269.
- 270.
- 271.
- 272.
- 273.

**Goal** The goal for Kingston Elementary students is to improve in content and style on open response questions through the use of best practices and strategies and teacher instruction; to increase levels of proficiency and advancement; and to make AYP for 2011-12 school year.

**Benchmark** In 2012, all student groups are expected to meet or exceed the AYP target of 85.60, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth Provision. All student groups meet or exceeded the AYP target score in 2011, 2010, and 2009.

Intervention: The staff at Kingston Elementary School will read and implement Common Core State Standards for literacy.				
Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of The Learning Institute interim assessment testing service, scantron license renewal, and scantron testing supplies. The Learning Institute also provides literacy, math and science curriculum support. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$5,716.00  <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$5,716.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$5,716.00</b>

**KINGSTON HIGH SCHOOL -- \$59853**

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 -- \$8937**

Priority 2: Improve Literacy Skills

- Supporting Data:
1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT:
  2. The literacy teacher will be trained in Common Core Standards. The teacher

3. will read, implement, and practice concepts of Common Core this school year.
4. The teacher will the TLI reading program and alignment the AR Frameworks with
5. Common Core. Seventh grade has a need to improve on reading literacy in
6. multiple choice; eight grade in reading (practical passage in multiple choice and
7. open-response, and EOC literacy in reading (content passage).
8. Literacy
9. AUGMENTED BENCHMARK: ACTAAP
10. 1. Combined Population:
11. Year: 2011~2010~2009
12. Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested
13. Seventh Grade: 80~94~47~~15~18~19
14. Eighth Grade: 100~47~53~~19~17~18
15. EOC Literacy: 84~58~80~~18~na~na
- 16.
17. 2. Caucasian Population:
18. Year: 2011~2010~2009
19. Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested
20. Seventh Grade: 80~89~53~~15~17~17
21. Eighth Grade: 100~47~53~~19~15~16
22. EOC Literacy: 87~75~na~~18~na~na
- 23.
24. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:
25. Year: 2011~2010~2009
26. Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested
27. Seventh Grade: 70~47~67~~10~na~na
28. Eighth Grade: 100~55~69~~9~0~2
29. EOC Literacy: 80~na~na~~10~na~na
- 30.
31. The weak area in Seventh grade was reading (literary) in MC.
- 32.
33. The weak area in Eighth grade was reading (practical passage) and in MC and
34. multiple choice writing in open-response.
- 35.
36. The weak area in EOC Literacy was in reading (content passage).
- 37.
38. Normed Referenced Test
39. 1. Combined Population
40. Grade 7:
41. Year:2011~2010~2009
42. Number Tested:15~18~19
43. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:
44. Reading Comprehension:67~89~37
- 45.
46. 2. Caucasian Population:
47. Year:2011~2010~2009
48. Number Tested:15~17~17
49. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:
50. Reading Comprehension:67~94~35

51.  
52. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
53. Grade 7:  
54. Year:2011~2010~2009  
55. Number Tested: 10~7~12  
56. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:  
57. Reading Comprehension:67~71~33  
58.  
59. Grade 8:  
60. 1. Combined Population  
61. Year:2011~2010~2009  
62. Number Tested:19~17~18  
63. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:  
64. Reading Comprehension: 90~65~72  
65.  
66. 2. Caucasian Population:  
67. Grade 8:  
68. Year:2011~2010~2009  
69. Number Tested:18~15~16  
70. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:  
71. Reading Comprehension: 94~47~56  
72.  
73. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
74. Grade 8:  
75. Year:2011~2010~2009  
76. Number Tested:9~11~13  
77. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:  
78. Reading Comprehension: 89~55~69  
79.  
80. 1. Combined Populaton:  
81. Grade 9:  
82. Year:2011~2010~2009  
83. Number Tested:19~18~24  
84. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:  
85. Reading Comprehension: 68~78~71  
86.  
87. 2. Caucasian Population:  
88. Grade 9:  
89. Year:2011~2010~2009  
90. Number Tested:17~16~21  
91. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:  
92. Reading Comprehension: 65~75~71  
93.  
94. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
95. Grade 9:  
96. Year:2011~2010~2009  
97. Number Tested:11~14~13  
98. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:  
99. Reading Comprehension: 73~79~69  
100.  
101. Graduation Rate:  
102. 2008-67%  
103. 2009-95%  
104. 2010-RV~~less than 10 graduated  
105.  
106.

- 107.
- 108.
- 109.
- 110.
- 111.
- 112.
- 113.
- 114.
- 115.
- 116.
- 117.

Goal The goal for Kingston high school students in literacy is to meet the AYP target of 83.88. It is also the goal for the students to become proficient and fluent readers and writers.

Benchmark In 2011, 2010, and 2009 the combined populations and sub-groups meet AYP targets. In 2012, the combined populations and all sub-groups will meet or exceed the AYP of 83.88 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provisions.

Intervention: The Literacy teacher at Kingston High School will begin to read, study, and compare Math Common Core Standards with AR Frameworks. The teacher will familiarize herself with the crosswalk, strategies, and sign up for professional development for Common Core Standards.				
Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds to purchase a set of 11 Apple I Pads, protective covers, charging station cart, docking computer and student applications (apps), and protective insurance to address the areas of content and style, multiple choice writing, and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages. Teachers will evaluate the effectiveness by assigning projects that align with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will also evaluate using TLI module tests to determine if students are reaching those objectives. This program is supplemental to other programs provided for with local funds. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Marsha Shaver	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - \$8,937.00 Capital Outlay: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$8,937.00
Total Budget:				\$8,937.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$10275**

Priority 1: Mathematics

Supporting Data:

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:
2. To meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.30 and continue to improve with open response
3. questions.
- 4.
5. The weak areas in Seventh grade are open-response in Geometry, Measurement, and



6. Data Analysis and Probability.  
7.  
8. The weak areas in Eighth grade are Algebra and Measurement in both multiple  
9. choice and open response.  
10.  
11. The weak areas in EOC Algebra I are Solving Equations and Inequalities in MC  
12. and Language of Algebra in open response.  
13.  
14. The weak areas in EOC Geometry are Triangles in MC and all area in  
15. open-response.  
16.  
17. The math teacher will continue to go to professional development workshops to  
18. strength skills for open-response questions. The teacher will also continue  
19. using open-response released items to prompt her classes. Building principal  
20. and district curriculum administrator will support the teacher and give  
21. guidances as to best practices to strength the math program.  
22.  
23. Mathematics  
24. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
25. 1. Combined Population:  
26. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
27. Percent Proficeint or advanced ~ number tested  
28. Seventh Grade: 74%~89%~79%~~15~na~na  
29. Eighth Grade: 89%~76%~67%~~19~na~na  
30. EOC Algebra I: 91%~68%~56%~~22~na~na  
31. EOC Geometry: 73%~70%~78%~~13~na~na  
32.  
33. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
34. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
35. Percent Proficeint or advanced~~Number Tested  
36. Seventh Grade: 60%~71%~75%~~10~na~na  
37. Eighth Grade: 89%~82%~59%~~10~na~na  
38. EOC Algebra I: 80%~77%~69%~~22~na~na  
39. EOC Geometry: 89%~66%~71%~~9~na~na  
40.  
41. 3. Caucasian:  
42. Year: 2011~2010~2009  
43. Percent Proficeint or advanced~~Number Tested  
44. Seventh Grade: 74%~94%~75%~~11~na~na  
45. Eighth Grade: 95%~73%~60%~~18~na~na  
46. EOC Algebra I: 95%~65%~69%~~21~na~na  
47. EOC Geometry: 69%~76%~76%~~13~na~na  
48.  
49.  
50. NORM REFERENCED TEST~ ITBS  
51. GRADE 7  
52. 1. COMBINED POPULATION

53. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
54. NUMBER TESTED:15~18~19  
55. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
56. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 74~89~79  
57.  
58. 2. CAUCASIAN POPULATION  
59. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
60. NUMBER TESTED:11~17~17  
61. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
62. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 74~94~75  
63.  
64. 3.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED:  
65. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
66. NUMBER TESTED: 10~7~12  
67. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
68. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 60~71~75  
69.  
  
70.  
71. NORM REFERENCED TEST~ITBS  
72. GRADE 8  
73. 1. COMBINED POPULATION  
74. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
75. NUMBER TESTED:19~ 17~18  
76. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
77. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 90~76~67  
78.  
79. 2. CAUCASIAN POPULATION  
80. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
81. NUMBER TESTED:18~15~16  
82. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
83. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION:89~73~60  
84.  
85. 3.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED:  
86. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
87. NUMBER TESTED: 9~11~13  
88. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
89. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 78~82~59  
90.  
91. GRADE 9  
92. 1. COMBINED POPULATION  
93. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
94. NUMBER TESTED:19~18`24  
95. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
96. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 84~83~71  
97.  
98. GRADE 9  
99. 2. Caucasian Population:  
100. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
101. NUMBER TESTED:17~16~21  
102. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
103. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 83~81~71  
104.  
105. GRADE 9  
106. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
107. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009

- 108. NUMBER TESTED:11~14~13
- 109. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:
- 110. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 73~86~77
- 111.
- 112.
- 113.
- 114.
- 115.
- 116.
- 117.
- 118.
- 119. Graduation Rate:
- 120. 2008~67%
- 121. 2009~95%
- 122. 2010~RV (restricted value less than 10)
- 123.
- 124.
- 125.
- 126.
- 127.
- 128.
- 129.
- 130.
- 131.
- 132.
- 133.
- 134.
- 135.
- 136.
- 137.
- 138.

**Goal** Our goal for Kingston High School students is to meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.30 in the sub-populations of caucasian and economically disadvantaged and to continue to raise open-response scores.

**Benchmark** In 2012 the combined population and subgroups are expected to meet or exceed the AYP target of 82.30 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth Provisions. In 2011, 2010, and 2009 all combined populatons and sub-groups meet or exceeded the AYP targets.

Intervention: The Math teacher at Kingston High School will begin to read, study, and compare Math Common Core Standards with AR Frameworks. The teacher will familiarize herself with the crosswalk, strategies, and sign up for professional development for Common Core.				
Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
EQUITY: Hire .25 FTE highly qualified High School counselor to supplement the required counseling position. This employment is supplemental to the	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$4,000.00 Employee Benefits:

program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity				ACTION BUDGET: \$4,000.00
Total Budget:				\$4,000.00

Priority 3: Wellness

1. Kingston High School Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of
2. students who may be at risk of poor academic performance.
3. 2010-11 BMI Classification Data:
4. Grade 8:
5. 5 Males~~NA < ten
6. 13 Females~~53.8% Healty or underweight; 46.2% overweight or obese
7. Grade 10:
8. 4 Males~~NA < ten
9. 7 Females~~NA < ten
10. 2009-10 A report for this school is not availble for this year.
- 11.
12. Body Mass Classifications 2008-09:
13. 12 Males, 58.3% Healthy or Underweight, 41.7% Overweight or Obese.
14. 13 Females, 38.5% Healthy or Underweight, and 61.5% Overweight or Obese.
- 15.
16. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 96 student population, 30 students were
17. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of
18. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
19. High School: Males-38.9%, Females-25.0%
- 20.
- 21.
22. Body Mass Index Data SY 2006-07: of the 94 student population, 81 students
23. were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent
24. of students at risk of overweight and overweight:
25. High School: Males-35.4%, Females-36.4%
- 26.
- 27.
- 28.
- 29.
30. School Health Index
31. Overall Score Card
32. 2010-11: The SHI was not performed~~no data results
33. For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score
34. falls.

Supporting Data:

35. Low 0-20%, 21-40%; Medium 41-60%, 61-80%;
36. High 81-100%:
37. School Health Policies and Environment -
38. Module 1 - REQUIRED 80%
39. Health Education -
40. Module 2 - REQUIRED 71%
41. Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - Module 3 - REQUIRED
42. 79%
43. Nutrition Services -
44. Module 4 - REQUIRED 38%
45. School Health Services -
46. Module 5 - OPTIONAL
47. School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service - Module 6 - OPTIONAL
- 48.
49. Health Promotion for Staff -
50. Module 7 - OPTIONAL
51. Family and Community Involvement - Module 8 - REQUIRED 11%
- 52.
- 53.
- 54.
55. 2010-11: Free and Reduced Eligibility:59%
56. 2009-10: Free and Reduced Eligibility:59%
57. 2008-09:Free and Reduced Eligibility:57%
- 58.
- 59.
- 60.
- 61.
62. Madison County Unemployment Rate: Month of December
- 63.
64. 2010: 6.8%
65. 2009: 6.4%
66. 2008: 5.3%
- 67.
68. An increase of 1.5% in the last 3 years.
- 69.
70. Graduation Rate:
71. 2008~67%
72. 2009~95%
73. 2010~RV (restricted value less than 10)
- 74.
- 75.
- 76.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
- 80.
- 81.
- 82.
- 83.
- 84.

**Goal** Kingston High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

**Benchmark** At the end of 2011-12 school year, 10% of high school students will have decreased the BMI classification.

Intervention: The School nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, education Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .325 FTE School nurse to supplement required district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$6,275.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,275.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$6,275.00</b>

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$34925**

Priority 1: Mathematics

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:
2. To meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.30 and continue to improve with open response questions.
3. questions.
- 4.
5. The weak areas in Seventh grade are open-response in Geometry, Measurement, and
6. Data Analysis and Probability.
- 7.
8. The weak areas in Eighth grade are Algebra and Measurement in both multiple
9. choice and open response.
- 10.
11. The weak areas in EOC Algebra I are Solving Equations and Inequalities in MC
12. and Language of Algebra in open response.
- 13.
14. The weak areas in EOC Geometry are Triangles in MC and all area in
15. open-response.
- 16.
17. The math teacher will continue to go to professional development workshops to
18. strength skills for open-response questions. The teacher will also continue
19. using open-response released items to prompt her classes. Building principal

Supporting Data:

20. and district curriculum administrator will support the teacher and give

21. guidances as to best practices to strength the math program.

22.

23. Mathematics

24. Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

25. 1. Combined Population:

26. Year: 2011~2010~2009

27. Percent Proficeint or advanced ~ number tested

28. Seventh Grade: 74%~89%~79%~~15~na~na

29. Eighth Grade: 89%~76%~67%~~19~na~na

30. EOC Algebra I: 91%~68%~56%~~22~na~na

31. EOC Geometry: 73%~70%~78%~~13~na~na

32.

33. 2. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):

34. Year: 2011~2010~2009

35. Percent Proficeint or advanced~~Number Tested

36. Seventh Grade: 60%~71%~75%~~10~na~na

37. Eighth Grade: 89%~82%~59%~~10~na~na

38. EOC Algebra I: 80%~77%~69%~~22~na~na

39. EOC Geometry: 89%~66%~71%~~9~na~na

40.

41. 3. Caucasian:

42. Year: 2011~2010~2009

43. Percent Proficeint or advanced~~Number Tested

44. Seventh Grade: 74%~94%~75%~~11~na~na

45. Eighth Grade: 95%~73%~60%~~18~na~na

46. EOC Algebra I: 95%~65%~69%~~21~na~na

47. EOC Geometry: 69%~76%~76%~~13~na~na

48.

49.

50. NORM REFERENCED TEST~ ITBS

51. GRADE 7

52. 1. COMBINED POPULATION

53. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009

54. NUMBER TESTED:15~18~19

55. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:

56. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 74~89~79

57.

58. 2. CAUCASIAN POPULATION

59. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009

60. NUMBER TESTED:11~17~17

61. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:

62. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 74~94~75

63.

64. 3.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED:

65. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009

66. NUMBER TESTED: 10~7~12

67. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:

68. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 60~71~75

69.

70.

71. NORM REFERENCED TEST~ITBS

72. GRADE 8  
73. 1. COMBINED POPULATION  
74. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
75. NUMBER TESTED:19~ 17~18  
76. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
77. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 90~76~67  
78.  
79. 2. CAUCASIAN POPULATION  
80. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
81. NUMBER TESTED:18~15~16  
82. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
83. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION:89~73~60  
84.  
85. 3.ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED:  
86. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
87. NUMBER TESTED: 9~11~13  
88. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
89. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 78~82~59  
90.  
91. GRADE 9  
92. 1. COMBINED POPULATION  
93. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
94. NUMBER TESTED:19~18`24  
95. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
96. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 84~83~71  
97.  
98. GRADE 9  
99. 2. Caucasian Population:  
100. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
101. NUMBER TESTED:17~16~21  
102. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
103. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 83~81~71  
104.  
105. GRADE 9  
106. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:  
107. YEAR: 2011~2010~2009  
108. NUMBER TESTED:11~14~13  
109. % AT/ABOVE 50TH NPR IN:  
110. MATH TOTAL WITHOUT COMPUTATION: 73~86~77  
111.  
  
112.  
113.  
114.  
115.  
116.  
117.  
118.  
119. Graduation Rate:  
120. 2008~67%  
121. 2009~95%  
122. 2010~RV (restricted value less than 10)  
123.  
  
124.  
125.



- 126.
- 127.
- 128.
- 129.
- 130.
- 131.
- 132.
- 133.
- 134.
- 135.
- 136.
- 137.
- 138.

**Goal** Our goal for Kingston High School students is to meet the 2012 AYP target of 82.30 in the sub-populations of caucasian and economically disadvantaged and to continue to raise open-response scores.

**Benchmark** In 2012 the combined population and subgroups are expected to meet or exceed the AYP target of 82.30 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth Provisions. In 2011, 2010, and 2009 all combined populations and sub-groups meet or exceeded the AYP targets.

Intervention: The Math teacher at Kingston High School will begin to read, study, and compare Math Common Core Standards with AR Frameworks. The teacher will familiarize herself with the crosswalk, strategies, and sign up for professional development for Common Core.				
Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
EQUITY: Hire .25 FTE highly qualified High School counselor to supplement the required counseling position. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$15,000.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$15,000.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$15,000.00</b>

**Priority 3: Wellness**

1. Kingston High School Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of
2. students who may be at risk of poor academic performance.
3. 2010-11 BMI Classification Data:
4. Grade 8:
5. 5 Males~~NA < ten
6. 13 Females~~53.8% Healty or underweight; 46.2% overweight or obese
7. Grade 10:
8. 4 Males~~NA < ten

**Supporting Data:**

9. 7 Females~~NA < ten
10. 2009-10 A report for this school is not available for this year.
- 11.
12. Body Mass Classifications 2008-09:
13. 12 Males, 58.3% Healthy or Underweight, 41.7% Overweight or Obese.
14. 13 Females, 38.5% Healthy or Underweight, and 61.5% Overweight or Obese.
- 15.
16. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 96 student population, 30 students were
17. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of
18. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
19. High School: Males-38.9%, Females-25.0%
- 20.
- 21.
22. Body Mass Index Data SY 2006-07: of the 94 student population, 81 students
23. were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent
24. of students at risk of overweight and overweight:
25. High School: Males-35.4%, Females-36.4%
- 26.
- 27.
- 28.
- 29.
30. School Health Index
31. Overall Score Card
32. 2010-11: The SHI was not performed~~no data results
33. For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score
34. falls.
35. Low 0-20%, 21-40%; Medium 41-60%, 61-80%;
36. High 81-100%:
37. School Health Policies and Environment -
38. Module 1 - REQUIRED 80%
39. Health Education -
40. Module 2 - REQUIRED 71%
41. Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - Module 3 - REQUIRED
42. 79%
43. Nutrition Services -
44. Module 4 - REQUIRED 38%
45. School Health Services -
46. Module 5 - OPTIONAL
47. School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service - Module 6 - OPTIONAL
- 48.
49. Health Promotion for Staff -
50. Module 7 - OPTIONAL
51. Family and Community Involvement - Module 8 - REQUIRED 11%

- 52.
- 53.
- 54.
- 55. 2010-11: Free and Reduced Eligibility:59%
- 56. 2009-10: Free and Reduced Eligibility:59%
- 57. 2008-09:Free and Reduced Eligibility:57%
- 58.
- 59.
- 60.
- 61.
- 62. Madison County Unemployment Rate: Month of December
- 63.
- 64. 2010: 6.8%
- 65. 2009: 6.4%
- 66. 2008: 5.3%
- 67.
- 68. An increase of 1.5% in the last 3 years.
- 69.
- 70. Graduation Rate:
- 71. 2008~67%
- 72. 2009~95%
- 73. 2010~RV (restricted value less than 10)
- 74.
- 75.
- 76.
- 77.
- 78.
- 79.
- 80.
- 81.
- 82.
- 83.
- 84.
- 85.

**Goal** Kingston High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

**Benchmark** At the end of 2011-12 school year, 10% of high school students will have decreased the BMI classification.

Intervention: The School nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, education Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .325 FTE School nurse to supplement required district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds.	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$19,925.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$19,925.00

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
Total Budget:				\$19,925.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$0**

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies".

**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 -- \$5716**

Priority 2: Improve Literacy Skills

Supporting Data:

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT:
2. The literacy teacher will be trained in Common Core Standards. The teacher
3. will read, implement, and practice concepts of Common Core this school year.
4. The teacher will the TLI reading program and alignment the AR Frameworks with
5. Common Core. Seventh grade has a need to improve on reading literacy in
6. multiple choice; eight grade in reading (practical pagge in multiple choice and
7. open-response, and EOC literacy in reading (content passage).
8. Literacy
9. AUGMENTED BENCHMARK: ACTAAP
10. 1. Combined Population:
11. Year: 2011~2010~2009
12. Percent Proficeint or Advaned~~Number Tested
13. Seventh Grade: 80~94~47~~15~18~19
14. Eighth Grade: 100~47~53~~19~17~18
15. EOC Literacy: 84~58~80~~18~na~na
- 16.
17. 2. Caucasian Population:
18. Year: 2011~2010~2009
19. Percent Proficeint or Advaned~~Number Tested
20. Seventh Grade: 80~89~53~~15~17~17
21. Eighth Grade: 100~47~53~~19~15~16
22. EOC Literacy: 87~75~na~~18~na~na
- 23.
24. 3. Econmically Disadvantaged:
25. Year: 2011~2010~2009
26. Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested
27. Seventh Grade: 70~47~67~~10~na~na
28. Eighth Grade: 100~55~69~~9~0~2
29. EOC Literacy: 80~na~na~~10~na~na
- 30.
31. The weak area in Seventh grade was reading (literary) in MC.
- 32.
33. The weak area in Eighth grade was reading (practical passage)andin MC and
34. multiple choice writing in open-response.
- 35.

36. The weak area in EOC Literacy was in reading (content passage).

37.

38. Normed Referenced Test

39. 1. Combined Population

40. Grade 7:

41. Year:2011~2010~2009

42. Number Tested:15~18~19

43. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:

44. Reading Comprehension:67~89~37

45.

46. 2. Caucasian Populaton:

47. Year:2011~2010~2009

48. Number Tested:15~17~17

49. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:

50. Reading Comprehension:67~94~35

51.

52. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

53. Grade 7:

54. Year:2011~2010~2009

55. Number Tested: 10~7~12

56. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:

57. Reading Comprehension:67~71~33

58.

59. Grade 8:

60. 1. Combined Population

61. Year:2011~2010~2009

62. Number Tested:19~17~18

63. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:

64. Reading Comprehension: 90~65~72

65.

66. 2. Caucasian Population:

67. Grade 8:

68. Year:2011~2010~2009

69. Number Tested:18~15~16

70. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:

71. Reading Comprehension: 94~47~56

72.

73. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:

74. Grade 8:

75. Year:2011~2010~2009

76. Number Tested:9~11~13

77. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:

78. Reading Comprehension: 89~55~69

79.

80. 1. Combined Populaton:

81. Grade 9:

82. Year:2011~2010~2009

83. Number Tested:19~18~24

84. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:

85. Reading Comprehension: 68~78~71

86.

87. 2. Caucasian Population:

88. Grade 9:

89. Year:2011~2010~2009

90. Number Tested:17~16~21

- 91. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:
- 92. Reading Comprehension: 65~75~71
- 93.
- 94. 3. Economically Disadvantaged:
- 95. Grade 9:
- 96. Year:2011~2010~2009
- 97. Number Tested:11~14~13
- 98. %Ar/Above 50th NPR in:
- 99. Reading Comprehension: 73~79~69
- 100.
- 101. Graduation Rate:
- 102. 2008-67%
- 103. 2009-95%
- 104. 2010-RV~~less than 10 graduated
- 105.
- 106.
- 107.
- 108.
- 109.
- 110.
- 111.
- 112.
- 113.
- 114.
- 115.
- 116.
- 117.

**Goal** The goal for Kingston high school students in literacy is to meet the AYP target of 83.88. It is also the goal for the students to become proficient and fluent readers and writers.

**Benchmark** In 2011, 2010, and 2009 the combined populations and sub-groups meet AYP targets. In 2012, the combined populations and all sub-groups will meet or exceed the AYP of 83.88 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provisions.

Intervention: The Literacy teacher at Kingston High School will begin to read, study, and compare Math Common Core Standards with AR Frameworks. The teacher will familiarize herself with the crosswalk, strategies, and sign up for professional development for Common Core Standards.				
Scientific Based Research: This is an Arkansas State Initiative that will be fully implemented by the year 2013 in literacy and math in all school districts in Arkansas.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of The Learning Institute interim assessment testing service, scantron license renewal, and scantron testing supplies. The Learning Institute also provides literacy, math and science curriculum support. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Alignment	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) \$5,716.00 - Purchased Services: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$5,716.00
Total Budget:				\$5,716.00

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 -- \$6092**

Priority 1: To Improve Literacy Skills

Supporting  
Data:

1. Combined Population: Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 65.4 scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.28% scored proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
2. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
3. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 0% scored proficient or advanced. In
4. 2009, 41.26% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 35.6% scored proficient or
5. advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice
6. questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest
7. identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of the
8. open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest
9. identified areas are: Content and Mechanics.
10. English Language Learners (ELL):
11. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
12. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
13. than "10" ELL students tested.
14. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
15. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 70.0% scored proficient or
16. advanced. In 2009, 59.3% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.28% scored
17. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
18. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
19. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
20. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
21. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
22. Caucasian:
23. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or
24. advanced. In 2009, 58.4% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 52.9% scored

25. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
26. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
27. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
28. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
29. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
30. African-American:
31. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
32. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
33. than "10" African-American students tested.
34. Hispanic:
35. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
36. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
37. "10" Hispanic students tested.
38. Combined Population:
39. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or
40. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 57.03% scored
41. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
42. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
43. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
44. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
45. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
46. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
47. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or advanced.
48. In 2009, 52.7% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 29.3 scored proficient
49. or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
50. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
51. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
52. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
53. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
54. English Language Learners (ELL):
55. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
56. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
57. than "10" ELL students tested.
58. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)



59. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 85.0% scored proficient or
60. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55.2% scored
61. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
62. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
63. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend
64. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
65. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical.
66. Caucasian:
67. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or
68. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55.2% scored
69. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
70. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
71. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
72. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
73. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
74. African-American:
75. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
76. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
77. than "10" African-American students tested.
78. Hispanic:
79. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
80. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
81. "10" Hispanic students tested.
82. Combined Population:
83. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 82.0% scored proficient or
84. advanced. In 2009, 60.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 59.5% scored
85. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
86. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
87. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
88. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
89. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
90. Students with Disabilities (IEP):

91. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, (0 students) scored proficient or
92. advanced. In 2009, 41.45% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 38.28% scored
93. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
94. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
95. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
96. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
97. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
98. English Language Learners (ELL):
99. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
100. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
101. than "10" ELL students tested.
102. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
103. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 90.0% scored proficient or
104. advanced. In 2009, 54.9% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.0% scored
105. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
106. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
107. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
108. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
109. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
110. Caucasian:
111. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 82.0% scored proficient or
112. advanced. In 2009, 59.35% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 56.45% scored
113. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
114. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
115. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
116. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
117. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
118. African-American:
119. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
120. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
121. than "10" African-American students tested.
122. Hispanic:
123. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

124. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than

125. "10" Hispanic students tested.

126. Combined Population:

127. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or

128. advanced. In 2009, 60.8% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 64.9% scored

129. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and

130. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed

131. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend

132. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed

133. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.

134. Students with Disabilities (IEP):

135. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 0.0% scored proficient or

136. advanced. In 2009, 42.7% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 35.95% scored

137. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and

138. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed

139. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend

140. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed

141. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.

142. English Language Learners (ELL):

143. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

144. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer

145. than "10" ELL students tested.

146. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)

147. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 40.0% scored proficient or

148. advanced. In 2009, 59.9% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 66.85% scored

149. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and

150. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed

151. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend

152. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed

153. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.

154. Caucasian:

155. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or

156. advanced. In 2009, 64.08% scored proficient or advanced.  
In 2008, 67.18% scored
157. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of  
the open response and
158. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of  
reading passages, revealed
159. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and  
Practical. The 3 year trend
160. analysis of the open response questions in the five  
writing domains revealed
161. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and  
Style.
162. African-American:
163. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
164. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school  
years, there were fewer
165. than "10" African-American students tested.
166. Hispanic:
167. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
168. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school  
year, there were fewer than
169. "10" Hispanic students tested.
- 170.
171. Combined Population:
172. Grade 1 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 14.3% scored  
at/above the 50th
173. percentile.
174. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008,  
33.3 scored at/above the
175. 50th percentile.
176. Combined Population:
177. Grade 2 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 100.0% scored  
at/above the 50th
178. percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th  
percentile. In 2008, 52.4% scored
179. at/above the 50th percentile.
- 180.
181. Combined Population:
182. Grade 3 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 66.7% scored  
at/above the 50th
183. percentile.
184. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008,  
90.9% scored at/above  
the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 4 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 82.4% scored  
at/above the 50th  
percentile.

In 2009, 57% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In  
2008, 41.7% scored  
at/above the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 5 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 50.0% scored  
at/above the 50th  
percentile.

In 2009, 67% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 46.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
 Combined Population:  
 Grade 6 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 33.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
 In 2009, 62% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 58.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

- 185.
- 186. In 2011, the attendance rate was 95.4%
- 187. In 2010, the attendance rate was 95.4%
- 188. In 2009, the attendance rate was 94.3%.
- 189.
- 190. <
- 191.
- 192.
- 193.
- 194.
- 195.
- 196.
- 197.
- 198.
- 199.
- 200.
- 201.

**Goal** All students will improve their reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum.

**Benchmark** In 2012, all student groups will meet or exceeded the AYP target of 85.6 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.. In 2011 the AYP target of 78.40 was met by the Combined Population and all subgroups.

Intervention: The staff at Oark Elementary School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds to purchase a set of 9 Apple I Pads, protective covers, charging station cart, docking computer and student applications (apps), and protective insurance to address the areas of content and style, multiple choice writing, and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages. Teachers will evaluate the	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - \$6,092.00 Capital Outlay: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,092.00

effectiveness by assigning projects that align with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will also evaluate using TLI module tests to determine if students are reaching those objectives. This program is supplemental to other programs provided for with local funds. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Total Budget:				\$6,092.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6752**

- Priority 2: Improve Mathematics Skills
1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT- The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend
  2. analysis in the three through six grades of the open response and multiple
  3. choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in
  4. Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.
  - 5.
  6. Combined Population:
  7. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
  8. In 2010, 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.1% scored proficient
  9. or advanced. In 2008, 54.98% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
  10. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
  11. questions)in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement
  12. and Data Analysis. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend
  13. analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands,
  14. revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Geometry.
  15. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
  16. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
  17. In 2010, 100.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 62.9% scored proficient
  18. or advanced. In 2008, 52.92 scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
  19. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
  20. questions)in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis
  21. and Probability and Measurement The lowest identified areas (based on the 3
  22. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics
  23. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.
  24. English Language Learners (ELL):
  25. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

Supporting Data:

26. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
27. then "10" ELL students tested.
28. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):
29. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
30. In 2010, 80.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 60.26% scored proficient
31. or advanced. In 2008, 54.98% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
32. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
33. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement
34. and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3
35. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics
36. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.
37. Caucasian:
38. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
39. In 2010, 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 59.16% scored proficient
40. or advanced. In 2008, 54.98% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
41. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
42. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement
43. and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3
44. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics
45. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.
46. African-American:
47. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
48. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
49. than "10" African-American students tested.
50. Hispanic:
51. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
52. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
53. "10" Hispanic students tested.
54. Combined Population:
55. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
56. In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.8% scored proficient
57. or advanced. In 2008, 56.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
58. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
59. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement

60. and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3

61. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics

62. strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.

63. Students with Disabilities (IEP):

64. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

65. In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 68.06% scored proficient

66. or advanced. In 2008, 18.8% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

67. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

68. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra, and

69. Measurement. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis

70. of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed

71. weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.

72. English Language Learners (ELL):

73. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

74. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer

75. than "10" ELL students tested.

76. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):

77. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

78. In 2010, 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.2% scored proficient

79. or advanced. In 2008, 50.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

80. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

81. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement

82. and Algebra. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis

83. of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed

84. weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.

85. Caucasian:

86. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

87. In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.8% scored proficient

88. or advanced. In 2008, 54.76% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

89. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

90. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement

91. and Algebra. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of



92. the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed
93. weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.
94. African-American:
95. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
96. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
97. than "10" African-American students tested.
98. Hispanic:
99. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
100. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
101. "10" Hispanic students tested.
102. Combined Population:
103. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
104. In 2010, 54.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 52.58% scored proficient
105. or advanced. In 2008, 58.06% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
106. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
107. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and
108. Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year
109. trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics
110. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Number and Operations.
111. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
112. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
113. In 2010, (0 students) scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40.46% scored
114. proficient or advanced. In 2008, 46.9% scored proficient or advanced. The
115. lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open
116. response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in
117. Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas
118. (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the
119. five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurement.
120. English Language Learners (ELL):
121. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
122. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
123. than "10" ELL students tested.
124. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):
125. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
126. In 2010, 60.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 56.5% scored proficient

127. or advanced. In 2008, 57.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest  
128. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response  
129. questions)in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and  
130. Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year  
131. trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics  
132. strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.  
133. Caucasian:  
134. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:  
135. In 2010, 54.0% scored proficient or advanced.In 2009, 50.5% scored proficient  
136. or advanced. In 2008, 61.9% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest  
137. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response  
138. questions)in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and  
139. Data Analysis and Probability The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year  
140. trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics  
141. strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.  
142. African-American:  
143. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
144. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer  
145. then "10" African-American students tested.  
146. Hispanic:  
147. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
148. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than  
149. "10" Hispanic students tested.  
150. Combined Population:  
151. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:  
152. In 2010, 67.0% scored proficient or advanced.In 2009, 58.8% scored proficient  
153. or advanced. In 2008, 54.58% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest  
154. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response  
155. questions)in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and  
156. Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend  
157. analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands,  
158. revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.  
159. Students with Disabilities (IEP):  
160. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

161. In 2010, 0.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38.68% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 23.18% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurement. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

168. English Language Learners (ELL):  
169. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
170. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer than "10" ELL students tested.

172. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
173. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:  
174. In 2010, 60.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 55.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 56.3% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

181. Caucasian:  
182. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:  
183. In 2010, 67.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 61.1% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 56.68% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

190. African-American:  
191. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
192. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer than "10" African-American students tested.

194. Hispanic:

195. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
196. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than  
197. "10" Hispanic students tested.  
198.  
199.  
200.  
201.  
202.  
203.  
204. Combined Population:  
205. Grade 0 Norm Referenced Test: In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In  
206. 2008, N/A% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 72.7% scored at/above  
207. the 50th percentile.  
208. Combined Population:  
209. Grade 1 Norm Referenced Test:  
210. In 2010, 64.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 100% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 2 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 71.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 71.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 3 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 75.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 90.9% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 4 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 82.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 57% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 41.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 5 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 60.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 67% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 53.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 6 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 50.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 62% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 66.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

- 211.
- 212.
- 213.
  
- 214.
- 215.
- 216.
- 217.
- 218.
- 219.
- 220.
- 221.
- 222.
- 223.
- 224.
- 225.
- 226.
- 227.
- 228.
- 229.

Goal All students will show an improvement in math problem solving skills.  
 Benchmark In 2011 the AYP target of 77.50 was met by the combined population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 85.0 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Oark Elementary School will continue to implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Providing funds for a .25 Highly Qualified elementary Counselor. These funds are supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Jeff Cantrell	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$3,252.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$3,252.00
Total Budget:				\$3,252.00

Priority 3: Wellness

Supporting Data: 1. Oark Elementary Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of

2. students who may be at risk of poor academic performance.
3. 2009-10 No data was available for this school during this school year.
- 4.
5. Body Mass Classifications 2008-09:
6. No data was available for 2008-09
- 7.
8. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 84 student population, 56 students were
9. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of
10. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
11. Elementary: Males-48.0%, Females-38.7%;
- 12.
13. Body Mass Index Data SY 2006-07: of the 97 student population, 92 students
14. were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent
15. of students at risk of overweight and overweight:
16. Elementary: Males-50.0%, Females-37.0%;
- 17.
18. School Health Index Overall Score Card For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score falls. Low 0-20%, 21-40%; Medium 41-60%, 61-80%; High 81-100%: School Health Policies and Environment - Module 1 - REQUIRED 78% Health Education - Module 2 - REQUIRED 83% Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - Module 3 - REQUIRED 85% Nutrition Services - Module 4 - REQUIRED 83% School Health Services - Module 5 - OPTIONAL School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service - Module 6 - OPTIONAL Health Promotion for Staff - Module 7 - OPTIONAL Family and Community Involvement - Module 8 - REQUIRED 72%
19. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2009-10 Elementary: 19% Paid, 18% Reduced, and 63% Free. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2008-09 Elementary: 22% Paid, 25% Reduced, and 53% Free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 2007-08: Elementary - 22.6% paid, 22.6% reduced, 54.8% free; Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 2006-07: Elementary - 28.7% paid, 17.0% reduced; 54.3% Free;
20. Johnson County Unemployment Rate: 2006 - 5.0%;

Goal Oark Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Benchmark By the SY 2010-11 there will be an increase of at least 1/2% in the School Health Index score for each required module at each school within the district.

Intervention: The School nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, education Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE School nurse to supplement required district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$3,500.00

implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness				ACTION BUDGET: \$3,500.00
Total Budget:				\$3,500.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$23006**

Priority 2: Improve Mathematics Skills

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT- The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend
2. analysis in the three through six grades of the open response and multiple
3. choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in
4. Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.
- 5.
6. Combined Population:
7. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
8. In 2010, 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.1% scored proficient
9. or advanced. In 2008, 54.98% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
10. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
11. questions)in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement
12. and Data Analysis. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend
13. analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands,
14. revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Geometry.
15. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
16. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
17. In 2010, 100.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 62.9% scored proficient
18. or advanced. In 2008, 52.92 scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
19. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
20. questions)in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis
21. and Probability and Measurement The lowest identified areas (based on the 3
22. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics
23. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.
24. English Language Learners (ELL):
25. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
26. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
27. than "10" ELL students tested.
28. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):
29. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

Supporting Data:

30. In 2010, 80.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 60.26% scored proficient

31. or advanced. In 2008, 54.98% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

32. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

33. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement

34. and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3

35. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics

36. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

37. Caucasian:

38. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

39. In 2010, 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 59.16% scored proficient

40. or advanced. In 2008, 54.98% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

41. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

42. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement

43. and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3

44. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics

45. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability.

46. African-American:

47. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

48. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer

49. than "10" African-American students tested.

50. Hispanic:

51. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

52. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than

53. "10" Hispanic students tested.

54. Combined Population:

55. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

56. In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.8% scored proficient

57. or advanced. In 2008, 56.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

58. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

59. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement

60. and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3

61. year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics

62. strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.



63. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
64. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
65. In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 68.06% scored proficient
66. or advanced. In 2008, 18.8% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
67. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
68. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra, and
69. Measurement. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis
70. of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed
71. weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.
72. English Language Learners (ELL):
73. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
74. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
75. than "10" ELL students tested.
76. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):
77. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
78. In 2010, 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.2% scored proficient
79. or advanced. In 2008, 50.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
80. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
81. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement
82. and Algebra. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis
83. of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed
84. weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.
85. Caucasian:
86. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam:
87. In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 66.8% scored proficient
88. or advanced. In 2008, 54.76% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest
89. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response
90. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement
91. and Algebra. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of
92. the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed
93. weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability.
94. African-American:
95. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

96. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer  
97. then "10" African-American students tested.  
98. Hispanic:  
99. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
100. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than  
101. "10" Hispanic students tested.  
102. Combined Population:  
103. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:  
104. In 2010, 54.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 52.58% scored proficient  
105. or advanced. In 2008, 58.06% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest  
106. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response  
107. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and  
108. Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year  
109. trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics  
110. strands, revealed weaknesses in Measurement and Number and Operations.  
111. Students with Disabilities (IEP):  
112. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:  
113. In 2010, (0 students) scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40.46% scored  
114. proficient or advanced. In 2008, 46.9% scored proficient or advanced. The  
115. lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open  
116. response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in  
117. Measurement and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas  
118. (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the  
119. five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurement.  
120. English Language Learners (ELL):  
121. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:  
122. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer  
123. then "10" ELL students tested.  
124. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):  
125. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:  
126. In 2010, 60.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 56.5% scored proficient  
127. or advanced. In 2008, 57.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest  
128. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response  
129. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and

130. Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.

131. trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.

132. strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.

133. Caucasian:

134. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

135. In 2010, 54.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 50.5% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 61.9% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and

136. or advanced. In 2008, 61.9% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and

137. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and

138. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Geometry and

139. Data Analysis and Probability The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.

140. trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.

141. strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Measurement.

142. African-American:

143. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

144. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer than "10" African-American students tested.

145. then "10" African-American students tested.

146. Hispanic:

147. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

148. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than "10" Hispanic students tested.

149. "10" Hispanic students tested.

150. Combined Population:

151. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

152. In 2010, 67.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 58.8% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.58% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

153. or advanced. In 2008, 54.58% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

154. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

155. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

156. Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

157. analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

158. revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

159. Students with Disabilities (IEP):

160. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

161. In 2010, 0.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38.68% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 23.18% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the

162. advanced. In 2008, 23.18% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the

163. areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions) in the

164. five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurement The

165. lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the multiple

166. choice questions), in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in

167. Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

168. English Language Learners (ELL):

169. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

170. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer

171. than "10" ELL students tested.

172. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD):

173. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

174. In 2010, 60.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 55.48% scored proficient

175. or advanced. In 2008, 56.3% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

176. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

177. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and

178. Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend

179. analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands,

180. revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

181. Caucasian:

182. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam:

183. In 2010, 67.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 61.1% scored proficient

184. or advanced. In 2008, 56.68% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

185. identified areas (based on the 3 year trend analysis of the open response

186. questions) in the five mathematics strands, revealed weaknesses in Number and

187. Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas (based on the 3 year trend

188. analysis of the multiple choice questions), in the five mathematics strands,

189. revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Data Analysis and Probability.

190. African-American:

191. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

192. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer

193. than "10" African-American students tested.

194. Hispanic:

195. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

196. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than

197. "10" Hispanic students tested.

198.

199.

200.  
201.  
202.  
203.  
204. Combined Population:  
205. Grade 0 Norm Referenced Test: In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In  
206. 2008, N/A% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 72.7% scored at/above  
207. the 50th percentile.  
208. Combined Population:  
209. Grade 1 Norm Referenced Test:  
210. In 2010, 64.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 100% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 2 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 71.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 71.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 3 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 75.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 90.9% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 4 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 82.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 57% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 41.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 5 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 60.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 67% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 53.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.  
Combined Population:  
Grade 6 Norm Referenced Test:  
In 2010, 50.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 62% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 66.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.
211.  
212.

- 213.
- 214.
- 215.
- 216.
- 217.
- 218.
- 219.
- 220.
- 221.
- 222.
- 223.
- 224.
- 225.
- 226.
- 227.
- 228.
- 229.

**Goal** All students will show an improvement in math problem solving skills.

**Benchmark** In 2011 the AYP target of 77.50 was met by the combined population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet the 2012 AYP target of 85.0 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Oark Elementary School will continue to implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Providing funds for a .25 Highly Qualified elementary Counselor. These funds are supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Jeff Cantrell	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$13,006.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$13,006.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$13,006.00</b>

**Priority 3: Wellness**

- Supporting Data:**
1. Oark Elementary Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of
  2. students who may be at risk of poor academic performance.
  3. 2009-10 No data was available for this school during this school year.
  - 4.
  5. Body Mass Classifications 2008-09:
  6. No data was available for 2008-09

- 7.
8. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 84 student population, 56 students were
9. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of
10. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
11. Elementary: Males-48.0%, Females-38.7%;
- 12.
13. Body Mass Index Data SY 2006-07: of the 97 student population, 92 students
14. were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent
15. of students at risk of overweight and overweight:
16. Elementary: Males-50.0%, Females-37.0%;
- 17.
18. School Health Index Overall Score Card For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score falls. Low 0-20%, 21-40%; Medium 41-60%, 61-80%; High 81-100%: School Health Policies and Environment – Module 1 - REQUIRED 78% Health Education - Module 2 – REQUIRED 83% Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs – Module 3 - REQUIRED 85% Nutrition Services - Module 4 - REQUIRED 83% School Health Services – Module 5 - OPTIONAL School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service – Module 6 - OPTIONAL Health Promotion for Staff – Module 7 - OPTIONAL Family and Community Involvement – Module 8 - REQUIRED 72%
19. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2009-10 Elementary: 19% Paid, 18% Reduced, and 63% Free. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2008-09 Elementary: 22% Paid, 25% Reduced, and 53% Free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 2007-08: Elementary - 22.6% paid, 22.6% reduced, 54.8% free; Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 2006-07: Elementary - 28.7% paid, 17.0% reduced; 54.3% Free;
20. Johnson County Unemployment Rate: 2006 – 5.0%;

Goal Oark Elementary will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Benchmark By the SY 2010-11 there will be an increase of at least 1/2% in the School Health Index score for each required module at each school within the district.

Intervention: The School nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, education Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE School nurse to supplement required district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) \$10,000.00 - Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$10,000.00
Total Budget:				\$10,000.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859**

Priority 1: To Improve Literacy Skills

Supporting  
Data:

1. Combined Population: Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 65.4 scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.28% scored proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
2. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
3. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 0% scored proficient or advanced. In
4. 2009, 41.26% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 35.6% scored proficient or
5. advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice
6. questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest
7. identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of the
8. open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest
9. identified areas are: Content and Mechanics.
10. English Language Learners (ELL):
11. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
12. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
13. than "10" ELL students tested.
14. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
15. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 70.0% scored proficient or
16. advanced. In 2009, 59.3% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.28% scored
17. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
18. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
19. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
20. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
21. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
22. Caucasian:
23. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or
24. advanced. In 2009, 58.4% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 52.9% scored
25. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
26. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
27. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
28. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed



29. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
30. African-American:
31. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
32. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
33. than "10" African-American students tested.
34. Hispanic:
35. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
36. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
37. "10" Hispanic students tested.
38. Combined Population:
39. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or
40. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 57.03% scored
41. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
42. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
43. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
44. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
45. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
46. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
47. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or advanced.
48. In 2009, 52.7% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 29.3 scored proficient
49. or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
50. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
51. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
52. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
53. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
54. English Language Learners (ELL):
55. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
56. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
57. than "10" ELL students tested.
58. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
59. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 85.0% scored proficient or
60. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55.2% scored
61. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
62. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed

63. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend
64. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
65. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical.
66. Caucasian:
67. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or
68. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55.2% scored
69. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
70. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
71. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
72. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
73. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
74. African-American:
75. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
76. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
77. than "10" African-American students tested.
78. Hispanic:
79. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
80. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
81. "10" Hispanic students tested.
82. Combined Population:
83. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 82.0% scored proficient or
84. advanced. In 2009, 60.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 59.5% scored
85. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
86. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
87. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
88. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
89. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
90. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
91. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, (0 students) scored proficient or
92. advanced. In 2009, 41.45% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 38.28% scored
93. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
94. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed

95. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
96. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
97. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
98. English Language Learners (ELL):
99. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
100. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
101. then "10" ELL students tested.
102. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
103. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 90.0% scored proficient or
104. advanced. In 2009, 54.9% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.0% scored
105. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
106. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
107. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
108. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
109. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
110. Caucasian:
111. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 82.0% scored proficient or
112. advanced. In 2009, 59.35% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 56.45% scored
113. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
114. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
115. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
116. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
117. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
118. African-American:
119. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
120. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
121. than "10" African-American students tested.
122. Hispanic:
123. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
124. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
125. "10" Hispanic students tested.
126. Combined Population:
127. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or
128. advanced. In 2009, 60.8% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 64.9% scored

129. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
130. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
131. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend
132. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
133. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
134. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
135. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 0.0% scored proficient or
136. advanced. In 2009, 42.7% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 35.95% scored
137. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
138. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
139. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
140. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
141. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
142. English Language Learners (ELL):
143. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
144. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
145. than "10" ELL students tested.
146. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
147. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 40.0% scored proficient or
148. advanced. In 2009, 59.9% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 66.85% scored
149. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
150. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
151. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend
152. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
153. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
154. Caucasian:
155. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or
156. advanced. In 2009, 64.08% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 67.18% scored
157. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
158. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
159. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend

160. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
161. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
162. African-American:
163. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
164. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
165. than "10" African-American students tested.
166. Hispanic:
167. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
168. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
169. "10" Hispanic students tested.
- 170.
171. Combined Population:
172. Grade 1 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 14.3% scored at/above the 50th
173. percentile.
174. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 33.3 scored at/above the
175. 50th percentile.
176. Combined Population:
177. Grade 2 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 100.0% scored at/above the 50th
178. percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 52.4% scored
179. at/above the 50th percentile.
- 180.
181. Combined Population:
182. Grade 3 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 66.7% scored at/above the 50th
183. percentile.
184. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 90.9% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 4 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 82.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

In 2009, 57% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 41.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 5 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 50.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

In 2009, 67% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 46.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 6 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 33.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

In 2009, 62% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 58.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

- 185.
- 186. In 2011, the attendance rate was 95.4%
- 187. In 2010, the attendance rate was 95.4%
- 188. In 2009, the attendance rate was 94.3%.
- 189.
- 190. <
- 191.
- 192.
- 193.
- 194.
- 195.
- 196.
- 197.
- 198.
- 199.
- 200.
- 201.

**Goal** All students will improve their reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum.

**Benchmark** In 2012, all student groups will meet or exceeded the AYP target of 85.6 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.. In 2011 the AYP target of 78.40 was met by the Combined Population and all subgroups.

Intervention: The staff at Oark Elementary School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of supplemental reading materials. Items such as but not limited to books, magazines, or newspapers. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Equity	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$2,859.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,859.00
Total Budget:				\$2,859.00

**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 -- \$5716**  
Priority 1: To Improve Literacy Skills

Supporting  
Data:

1. Combined Population: Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 65.4 scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.28% scored proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
2. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
3. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 0% scored proficient or advanced. In
4. 2009, 41.26% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 35.6% scored proficient or
5. advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and multiple-choice
6. questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest
7. identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend analysis of the
8. open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest
9. identified areas are: Content and Mechanics.
10. English Language Learners (ELL):
11. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
12. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
13. than "10" ELL students tested.
14. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
15. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 70.0% scored proficient or
16. advanced. In 2009, 59.3% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.28% scored
17. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
18. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
19. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
20. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
21. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
22. Caucasian:
23. Grade 3 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or
24. advanced. In 2009, 58.4% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 52.9% scored
25. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
26. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
27. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
28. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
29. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
30. African-American:

31. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
32. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
33. than "10" African-American students tested.
34. Hispanic:
35. Grade 3 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
36. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
37. "10" Hispanic students tested.
38. Combined Population:
39. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or
40. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 57.03% scored
41. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
42. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
43. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
44. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
45. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
46. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
47. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 75.0% scored proficient or advanced.
48. In 2009, 52.7% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 29.3 scored proficient
49. or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
50. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
51. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
52. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
53. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
54. English Language Learners (ELL):
55. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
56. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
57. than "10" ELL students tested.
58. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
59. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 85.0% scored proficient or
60. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55.2% scored
61. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
62. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
63. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend



64. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
65. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical.
66. Caucasian:
67. Grade 4 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 88.0% scored proficient or
68. advanced. In 2009, 66.48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55.2% scored
69. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
70. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
71. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Content. The 3 year trend
72. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
73. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
74. African-American:
75. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
76. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
77. than "10" African-American students tested.
78. Hispanic:
79. Grade 4 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
80. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
81. "10" Hispanic students tested.
82. Combined Population:
83. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 82.0% scored proficient or
84. advanced. In 2009, 60.0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 59.5% scored
85. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
86. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
87. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
88. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
89. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
90. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
91. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam: In 2010, (0 students) scored proficient or
92. advanced. In 2009, 41.45% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 38.28% scored
93. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
94. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
95. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend

96. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed

97. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.

98. English Language Learners (ELL):

99. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

100. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer

101. then "10" ELL students tested.

102. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)

103. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 90.0% scored proficient or

104. advanced. In 2009, 54.9% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 54.0% scored

105. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and

106. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed

107. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend

108. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed

109. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.

110. Caucasian:

111. Grade 5 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 82.0% scored proficient or

112. advanced. In 2009, 59.35% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 56.45% scored

113. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and

114. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed

115. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend

116. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed

117. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.

118. African-American:

119. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

120. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer

121. then "10" African-American students tested.

122. Hispanic:

123. Grade 5 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:

124. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than

125. "10" Hispanic students tested.

126. Combined Population:

127. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or

128. advanced. In 2009, 60.8% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 64.9% scored

129. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and

130. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
131. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend
132. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
133. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
134. Students with Disabilities (IEP):
135. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 0.0% scored proficient or
136. advanced. In 2009, 42.7% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 35.95% scored
137. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
138. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
139. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Practical. The 3 year trend
140. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
141. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
142. English Language Learners (ELL):
143. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
144. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
145. than "10" ELL students tested.
146. Economically Disadvantaged (ESD)
147. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 40.0% scored proficient or
148. advanced. In 2009, 59.9% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 66.85% scored
149. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
150. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
151. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend
152. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed
153. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
154. Caucasian:
155. Grade 6 Augmented Benchmark Exam: In 2010, 50.0% scored proficient or
156. advanced. In 2009, 64.08% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 67.18% scored
157. proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the open response and
158. multiple-choice questions, in the three types of reading passages, revealed
159. that the lowest identified areas are: Literary and Practical. The 3 year trend
160. analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed

161. that the lowest identified areas are: Content and Style.
162. African-American:
163. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
164. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school years, there were fewer
165. then "10" African-American students tested.
166. Hispanic:
167. Grade 6 Augmented/Benchmark Exam:
168. In our building, during 2010, 2009, and 2008 school year, there were fewer than
169. "10" Hispanic students tested.
- 170.
171. Combined Population:
172. Grade 1 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 14.3% scored at/above the 50th
173. percentile.
174. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 33.3 scored at/above the
175. 50th percentile.
176. Combined Population:
177. Grade 2 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 100.0% scored at/above the 50th
178. percentile. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 52.4% scored
179. at/above the 50th percentile.
- 180.
181. Combined Population:
182. Grade 3 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 66.7% scored at/above the 50th
183. percentile.
184. In 2009, scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 90.9% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 4 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 82.4% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

In 2009, 57% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 41.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 5 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 50.0% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

In 2009, 67% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 46.7% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

Combined Population:

Grade 6 Norm Referenced Test: In 2010, 33.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

In 2009, 62% scored at/above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 58.3% scored at/above the 50th percentile.

- 185.
- 186. In 2011, the attendance rate was 95.4%
- 187. In 2010, the attendance rate was 95.4%
- 188. In 2009, the attendance rate was 94.3%.
- 189.
- 190. <
- 191.
- 192.
- 193.
- 194.
- 195.
- 196.
- 197.
- 198.
- 199.
- 200.
- 201.

**Goal** All students will improve their reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum.

**Benchmark** In 2012, all student groups will meet or exceeded the AYP target of 85.6 or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.. In 2011 the AYP target of 78.40 was met by the Combined Population and all subgroups.

Intervention: The staff at Oark Elementary School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of The Learning Institute interim assessment testing service, scantron license renewal, and scantron testing supplies. The Learning Institute also provides literacy, math and science curriculum support. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$5,716.00  <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$5,716.00
Total Budget:				\$5,716.00

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 -- \$12629**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. After studying literacy CRT data, our weakest area is READING: Literary Passage in 7th grade and Content Passage in grades 8 and 11. WRITING: Content and Style at all grade levels. The combined population and all sub-populations scored at or above the 43 percentile on the NRT at all grade levels.
2. 1. CRITERION REFERENCED TEST Combined Population--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 63%-55%-63% ~~ 16-11-8 Eighth Grade 60%-72%-58% ~~ 15-18-12 Eleventh Grade 53%-50%-43% ~~ 17-10-7 Economically Disadvantaged--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 57%-44%-50% ~~ 5-4-3 Eighth Grade 47%-44%-50% ~~ 6-5-5 Eleventh Grade 52%-38%-43% ~~6-3-3 Caucasian--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 62%-54%-63% ~~ 10-6-5 Eighth Grade 61%-54%-59% ~~ 8-13-7 Eleventh Grade 61%-50%-43% ~~ 9-5-3

- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.

Supporting Data:

12. NORM REFERENCED TEST
- 13.
14. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 7
15. Year 2009 2010 2011
16. Number Tested
17. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
18. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 19.
20. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 7
21. Year 2009 2010 2011
22. Number Tested
23. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
24. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 25.
26. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 7
27. Year 2009 2010 2011
28. Number Tested
29. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
30. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 31.
32. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES Grade: 7
33. Year 2009 2010 2011
34. Number Tested

35. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
36. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%  
37.  
38. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 8  
39. Year 2009 2010 2011  
40. Number Tested  
41. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
42. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
43.  
44. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 8  
45. Year 2009 2010 2011  
46. Number Tested  
47. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
48. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
49.  
50. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 8  
51. Year 2009 2010 2011  
52. Number Tested  
53. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
54. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
55.  
56. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
57. Year 2009 2010 2011  
58. Number Tested  
59. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
60. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
61.  
62. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 9  
63. Year 2009 2010 2011  
64. Number Tested  
65. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
66. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
67.  
68. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 9  
69. Year 2009 2010 2011  
70. Number Tested  
71. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
72. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
73.  
74. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
75. Year 2009 2010 2011  
76. Number Tested  
77. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
78. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
79.  
80.  
81.  
82.  
83.  
84.  
85.  
86.  
87.  
88. Graduation Rate:  
89.  
90. 2011--

- 91. 2010--
- 92. 2009--
- 93.
- 94.
- 95.
- 96.
- 97.
- 98.
- 99.
- 100.
- 101.
- 102.
- 103.
- 104.

Goal All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.  
 Benchmark In 2011, the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Oark High School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds to purchase 9 e-beam interactive white boards to accompany LCD instruction in the classroom. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Jeff Cantrell	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$6,539.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,539.00
Setting aside funds to purchase a set of 10 Apple I Pads, protective covers, charging station cart, docking computer and student applications (apps), and protective insurance to address the areas of content and style, multiple choice writing, and in answering open response questions in literary, content, and practical reading passages. Teachers will evaluate the effectiveness by assigning projects that align with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will also evaluate using TLI module tests to determine if students are reaching those objectives. This program is supplemental to other programs provided for with local funds.	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2011		NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay: \$6,090.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,090.00



Action Type: Equity				
Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Total Budget:				\$12,629.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6753**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. After studying literacy CRT data, our weakest area is READING: Literary Passage in 7th grade and Content Passage in grades 8 and 11. WRITING: Content and Style at all grade levels. The combined population and all sub-populations scored at or above the 43 percentile on the NRT at all grade levels.
2. 1. CRITERION REFERENCED TEST Combined Population--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 63%-55%-63% ~~ 16-11-8 Eighth Grade 60%-72%-58% ~~ 15-18-12 Eleventh Grade 53%-50%-43% ~~ 17-10-7 Economically Disadvantaged--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 57%-44%-50% ~~ 5-4-3 Eighth Grade 47%-44%-50% ~~ 6-5-5 Eleventh Grade 52%-38%-43% ~~6-3-3 Caucasian--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 62%-54%-63% ~~ 10-6-5 Eighth Grade 61%-54%-59% ~~ 8-13-7 Eleventh Grade 61%-50%-43% ~~ 9-5-3
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. NORM REFERENCED TEST
- 13.
14. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 7
15. Year 2009 2010 2011
16. Number Tested
17. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
18. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 19.
20. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 7
21. Year 2009 2010 2011
22. Number Tested
23. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
24. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 25.
26. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 7
27. Year 2009 2010 2011
28. Number Tested
29. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
30. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 31.
32. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES Grade: 7
33. Year 2009 2010 2011
34. Number Tested
35. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
36. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%

Supporting Data:

37.  
38. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 8  
39. Year 2009 2010 2011  
40. Number Tested  
41. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
42. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
43.  
44. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 8  
45. Year 2009 2010 2011  
46. Number Tested  
47. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
48. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
49.  
50. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 8  
51. Year 2009 2010 2011  
52. Number Tested  
53. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
54. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
55.  
56. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
57. Year 2009 2010 2011  
58. Number Tested  
59. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
60. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
61.  
62. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 9  
63. Year 2009 2010 2011  
64. Number Tested  
65. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
66. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
67.  
68. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 9  
69. Year 2009 2010 2011  
70. Number Tested  
71. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
72. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
73.  
74. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
75. Year 2009 2010 2011  
76. Number Tested  
77. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
78. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
79.  
80.  
81.  
82.  
83.  
84.  
85.  
86.  
87.  
88. Graduation Rate:  
89.  
90. 2011--  
91. 2010--  
92. 2009--

- 93.
- 94.
- 95.
- 96.
- 97.
- 98.
- 99.
- 100.
- 101.
- 102.
- 103.
- 104.

**Goal** All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.  
**Benchmark** In 2011, the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Oark High School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE highly qualified High School counselor to supplement the required counseling position. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$3,253.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$3,253.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$3,253.00</b>

**Priority 3: Wellness**

1. Oark High School Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of
  2. students who may be at risk of poor academic performance.
  - 3.
  4. 2009-10 No data available for this school year.
  - 5.
  6. Body Mass Classifications 2008-09.
  7. No data available for 2008-09.
  - 8.
  9. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 76 student population, 12 students were
- Supporting Data:**

10. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of
11. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
12. High School: Males-75.0%, Females-37.5%
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.
16. School Health Index Overall Score Card For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score falls. Low 0-20%, 21-40%; Medium 41-60%, 61-80%; High 81-100%, School Health Policies and Environment – Module 1 - REQUIRED 80% Health Education - Module 2 – REQUIRED 92% Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs – Module 3 - REQUIRED 89% Nutrition Services - Module 4 - REQUIRED 83% School Health Services – Module 5 - OPTIONAL School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service – Module 6 - OPTIONAL Health Promotion for Staff – Module 7 - OPTIONAL Family and Community Involvement – Module 8 - REQUIRED 61%
17. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2009-10.
18. 28% Paid, 17% Reduced, and 55% free.
- 19.
- 20.
21. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2008-09.
22. 27% Paid, 19% Reduced, and 54% free.
- 23.
24. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 2007-08:
25. High - 42.1% paid, 22.4% reduced, 35.5% free
- 26.
- 27.
- 28.
29. Johnson County Unemployment Rate: 2006 – 5.0%

Goal Oark High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Benchmark By the SY 2010-11 there will be an increase of at least 1/2% in the School Health Index score for each required module at each school within the district.

Intervention: The school nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, Educational Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE school nurse to supplement required 1.00 district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$3,500.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$3,500.00
Total Budget:				\$3,500.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$23006**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. After studying literacy CRT data, our weakest area is READING: Literary Passage in 7th grade and Content Passage in grades 8 and 11. WRITING: Content and Style at all grade levels. The combined population and all sub-populations scored at or above the 43 percentile on the NRT at all grade levels.
2. 1. CRITERION REFERENCED TEST Combined Population--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 63%-55%-63% ~~ 16-11-8 Eighth Grade 60%-72%-58% ~~ 15-18-12 Eleventh Grade 53%-50%-43% ~~ 17-10-7 Economically Disadvantaged--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 57%-44%-50% ~~ 5-4-3 Eighth Grade 47%-44%-50% ~~ 6-5-5 Eleventh Grade 52%-38%-43% ~~6-3-3 Caucasian--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 62%-54%-63% ~~ 10-6-5 Eighth Grade 61%-54%-59% ~~ 8-13-7 Eleventh Grade 61%-50%-43% ~~ 9-5-3
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. NORM REFERENCED TEST
- 13.
14. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 7
15. Year 2009 2010 2011
16. Number Tested
17. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
18. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 19.
20. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 7
21. Year 2009 2010 2011
22. Number Tested
23. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
24. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 25.
26. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 7
27. Year 2009 2010 2011
28. Number Tested
29. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
30. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 31.
32. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES Grade: 7
33. Year 2009 2010 2011
34. Number Tested
35. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
36. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 37.
38. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 8
39. Year 2009 2010 2011
40. Number Tested
41. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
42. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%
- 43.

Supporting  
Data:

44. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 8  
45. Year 2009 2010 2011  
46. Number Tested  
47. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
48. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
49.  
50. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 8  
51. Year 2009 2010 2011  
52. Number Tested  
53. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
54. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
55.  
56. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
57. Year 2009 2010 2011  
58. Number Tested  
59. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
60. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
61.  
62. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 9  
63. Year 2009 2010 2011  
64. Number Tested  
65. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
66. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
67.  
68. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 9  
69. Year 2009 2010 2011  
70. Number Tested  
71. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
72. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
73.  
74. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
75. Year 2009 2010 2011  
76. Number Tested  
77. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
78. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
79.  
80.  
81.  
82.  
83.  
84.  
85.  
86.  
87.  
88. Graduation Rate:  
89.  
90. 2011--  
91. 2010--  
92. 2009--  
93.  
94.  
95.  
96.  
97.  
98.  
99.

- 100.
- 101.
- 102.
- 103.
- 104.

**Goal** All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.  
 In 2011, the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

**Benchmark**

Intervention: The staff at Oark High School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE highly qualified High School counselor to supplement the required counseling position. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) \$13,006.00 - Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$13,006.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$13,006.00</b>

**Priority 3: Wellness**

1. Oark High School Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of
2. students who may be at risk of poor academic performance.
- 3.
4. 2009-10 No data available for this school year.
- 5.
6. Body Mass Classifications 2008-09.
7. No data available for 2008-09.
- 8.
9. Body Mass Index Data SY 2007-08 of the 76 student population, 12 students were
10. assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of
11. students at risk of overweight and overweight:
12. High School: Males-75.0%, Females-37.5%
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.
16. School Health Index Overall Score Card For each module (row), write the score in the column where the Module score falls. Low 0-20%, 21-40%;

**Supporting Data:**

Medium 41-60%, 61-80%; High 81-100%, School Health Policies and Environment – Module 1 - REQUIRED 80% Health Education - Module 2 – REQUIRED 92% Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs – Module 3 - REQUIRED 89% Nutrition Services - Module 4 - REQUIRED 83% School Health Services – Module 5 - OPTIONAL School Counseling, Psychological, and Social Service – Module 6 - OPTIONAL Health Promotion for Staff – Module 7 - OPTIONAL Family and Community Involvement – Module 8 - REQUIRED 61%

- 17. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2009-10.
- 18. 28% Paid, 17% Reduced, and 55% free.
- 19.
- 20.
- 21. Free and Reduced Eligibility 2008-09.
- 22. 27% Paid, 19% Reduced, and 54% free.
- 23.
- 24. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility SY 2007-08:
- 25. High - 42.1% paid, 22.4% reduced, 35.5% free
- 26.
- 27.
- 28.
- 29. Johnson County Unemployment Rate: 2006 – 5.0%

**Goal** Oark High School will provide support for students in making Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

**Benchmark** By the SY 2010-11 there will be an increase of at least 1/2% in the School Health Index score for each required module at each school within the district.

Intervention: The school nurse; A vital member of the education team.				
Scientific Based Research: The School Nurse: Norman Rita; CIJSEP, 1977, Educational Horizons.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Hire .25 FTE school nurse to supplement required 1.00 district nurse. This employment is supplemental to the program already implemented with state or local funds. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness	Kerry Saylor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$10,000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$10,000.00
Total Budget:				\$10,000.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2859**

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

1. 1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. After studying literacy CRT data, our weakest area is READING: Literary Passage in 7th grade and Content Passage in grades 8 and 11. WRITING: Content and Style at all grade levels. The combined population and all sub-populations scored at or above the 43 percentile on the NRT at all grade levels.
2. 1. CRITERION REFERENCED TEST Combined Population--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 63%-55%-63% ~~ 16-11-8 Eighth Grade 60%-72%-58% ~~ 15-18-12 Eleventh Grade



53%-50%-43% ~ 17-10-7 Economically Disadvantaged--2009/2010/2011  
Percent Proficient or Advanced ~ Number Tested Seventh Grade 57%-44%-  
50% ~ 5-4-3 Eighth Grade 47%-44%-50% ~ 6-5-5 Eleventh Grade 52%-  
38%-43% ~ 6-3-3 Caucasian--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or  
Advanced ~ Number Tested Seventh Grade 62%-54%-63% ~ 10-6-5 Eighth  
Grade 61%-54%-59% ~ 8-13-7 Eleventh Grade 61%-50%-43% ~ 9-5-3

- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. NORM REFERENCED TEST
- 13.
14. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 7
15. Year 2009 2010 2011
16. Number Tested
17. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
18. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 19.
20. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 7
21. Year 2009 2010 2011
22. Number Tested
23. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
24. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 25.
26. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 7
27. Year 2009 2010 2011
28. Number Tested
29. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
30. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 31.
32. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES Grade: 7
33. Year 2009 2010 2011
34. Number Tested
35. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
36. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%
- 37.
38. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 8
39. Year 2009 2010 2011
40. Number Tested
41. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
42. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%
- 43.
44. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 8
45. Year 2009 2010 2011
46. Number Tested
47. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
48. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%
- 49.
50. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 8
51. Year 2009 2010 2011
52. Number Tested
53. %At/Above 50th NPR In:

54. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
 55.  
 56. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
 57. Year 2009 2010 2011  
 58. Number Tested  
 59. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
 60. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
 61.  
 62. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 9  
 63. Year 2009 2010 2011  
 64. Number Tested  
 65. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
 66. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
 67.  
 68. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 9  
 69. Year 2009 2010 2011  
 70. Number Tested  
 71. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
 72. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
 73.  
 74. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
 75. Year 2009 2010 2011  
 76. Number Tested  
 77. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
 78. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
 79.  
 80.  
 81.  
 82.  
 83.  
 84.  
 85.  
 86.  
 87.  
 88. Graduation Rate:  
 89.  
 90. 2011--  
 91. 2010--  
 92. 2009--  
 93.  
 94.  
 95.  
 96.  
 97.  
 98.  
 99.  
 100.  
 101.  
 102.  
 103.  
 104.

Goal All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.  
 Benchmark In 2011, the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet or

exceed the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Oark High School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of supplemental reading materials. Items such as but not limited to books, magazines, or newspapers. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Equity	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$2,859.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$2,859.00
Total Budget:				\$2,859.00

**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 -- \$5716**

Priority 1: Literacy

1. 1. We currently have two sub-groups: Economically Disadvantaged and Caucasian. After studying literacy CRT data, our weakest area is READING: Literary Passage in 7th grade and Content Passage in grades 8 and 11. WRITING: Content and Style at all grade levels. The combined population and all sub-populations scored at or above the 43 percentile on the NRT at all grade levels.
2. 1. CRITERION REFERENCED TEST Combined Population--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 63%-55%-63% ~~ 16-11-8 Eighth Grade 60%-72%-58% ~~ 15-18-12 Eleventh Grade 53%-50%-43% ~~ 17-10-7 Economically Disadvantaged--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 57%-44%-50% ~~ 5-4-3 Eighth Grade 47%-44%-50% ~~ 6-5-5 Eleventh Grade 52%-38%-43% ~~6-3-3 Caucasian--2009/2010/2011 Percent Proficient or Advanced~~Number Tested Seventh Grade 62%-54%-63% ~~ 10-6-5 Eighth Grade 61%-54%-59% ~~ 8-13-7 Eleventh Grade 61%-50%-43% ~~ 9-5-3
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
12. NORM REFERENCED TEST
- 13.
14. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 7
15. Year 2009 2010 2011
16. Number Tested

Supporting Data:

17. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
18. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%  
19.  
20. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 7  
21. Year 2009 2010 2011  
22. Number Tested  
23. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
24. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%  
25.  
26. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 7  
27. Year 2009 2010 2011  
28. Number Tested  
29. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
30. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%  
31.  
32. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES Grade: 7  
33. Year 2009 2010 2011  
34. Number Tested  
35. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
36. Reading Comprehension ? 54.5%  
37.  
38. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 8  
39. Year 2009 2010 2011  
40. Number Tested  
41. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
42. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
43.  
44. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 8  
45. Year 2009 2010 2011  
46. Number Tested  
47. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
48. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
49.  
50. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 8  
51. Year 2009 2010 2011  
52. Number Tested  
53. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
54. Reading Comprehension 53.8% 42.9%  
55.  
56. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9  
57. Year 2009 2010 2011  
58. Number Tested  
59. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
60. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
61.  
62. CAUCASIAN POPULATION Grade: 9  
63. Year 2009 2010 2011  
64. Number Tested  
65. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
66. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%  
67.  
68. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED Grade: 9  
69. Year 2009 2010 2011  
70. Number Tested  
71. %At/Above 50th NPR In:  
72. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%

- 73.
- 74. COMBINED POPULATION Grade: 9
- 75. Year 2009 2010 2011
- 76. Number Tested
- 77. %At/Above 50th NPR In:
- 78. Reading Comprehension 40.0% 42.9%
- 79.
- 80.
- 81.
- 82.
- 83.
- 84.
- 85.
- 86.
- 87.
- 88. Graduation Rate:
- 89.
- 90. 2011--
- 91. 2010--
- 92. 2009--
- 93.
- 94.
- 95.
- 96.
- 97.
- 98.
- 99.
- 100.
- 101.
- 102.
- 103.
- 104.

Goal All students will demonstrate an improvement in their reading and writing abilities.  
 Benchmark In 2011, the AYP target of 75.81 was not met by the Combined Population and all subgroups. The combined population and all subgroups are expected to meet or exceed the 2012 AYP target of 83.88, or make gains to invoke the Safe Harbor or Growth provision.

Intervention: The staff at Oark High School will implement the strategies from Total Instructional Alignment.				
Scientific Based Research: Carter, Lisa.(2007. Total Instructional Alignment: From Standards to Student Success. Bloomington, IN: The Solution Tree Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2002). Assembly required: A continuous school improvement system. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Lezotte, L., & McKee, K. (2006). Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Setting aside funds for the purchase of The Learning Institute interim assessment testing service, scantron license renewal, and scantron testing supplies. The Learning Institute also provides	Wanda Mann	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$5,716.00 Purchased Services:

literacy, math and science curriculum support. This purchase is supplemental to programs already implemented with state and local funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation				ACTION BUDGET: \$5,716.00
Total Budget:				\$5,716.00