



## School Plan

Print Version

### WYNNE SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2011-2012

Approved: 11/22/2011 1:43 PM

Mission: To assure that all students will learn at their maximum potential.

Vision: Every graduate of the Wynne School District will leave prepared for success in the 21st Century.

Core Belief: We believe:

- 1) We must provide a challenging, relevant, curriculum aligned with state and national standards utilizing best teaching practices;
- 2) Learning comes from nurturing individual, diverse needs and talents of all learners in a secure environment;
- 3) We should create responsible citizenship through trusting and caring relationships;
- 4) We are creating lifelong learners and leaders of the future by holding everyone to high expectations;
- 5) We must actively engage the community to achieve excellence in education.

THEME: Wynne Public Schools - Excellence for Success

Grade Span:

Title I: Not Applicable

School Improvement:

### Table of Contents

#### Priority 1: Increase Student Achievement

**Goal:** To provide students, staff, and parents support in order for students to learn at their maximum potential in literacy and mathematics and to foster an orderly, safe, and healthy learning environment.

#### Priority 2: Drug Free Environment

**Goal:** Students in the Wynne School District will acquire the knowledge and attitudes needed to improve the behavioral climate at each campus. Students will develop positive character traits, reduce truancy, and acquire the skills necessary for a healthy, safe and drug free life.

#### Priority 4: Health and Wellness

**Goal:** The Wynne School District will provide support and assistance to promote appropriate nutrition education as part of the health education program as aligned with the Arkansas Physical Education and Health Education Frameworks.

#### Priority 5: Scholastic Audit

**Goal:** Build effective leaders to create a supportive learning culture at the Wynne Junior High.

**Goal:** Professional Development based on teacher and student needs.

**Goal:** Alignment of Curriculum Content Areas.

#### Priority 6: Special Education

**Goal:** Decrease the relative proportion of African American to Caucasian students receiving special services.

#### Priority 7: ELL

**Goal:** To ensure that all ELL students attain academic proficiency in the five domains: reading, writing, speaking, listening, and comprehension.

**Goal:** For students to achieve academic equality with non-ELL peers.

**Goal:** For ELL students to gain cultural competence and cross-cultural experiences.

#### Priority 8: Administrative Leadership and Support

**Goal:** To provide administrative leadership and support to Wynne School District building staff to enable students in meeting adequate yearly progress on state assessments in an effort to maintain AYP status associated with School Improvement.

#### Priority 10: Parental Involvement

**Goal:** All parents of children in the Wynne School District shall play an integral role in the education of their children.

#### Priority 11: Alternative Learning Environment

**Goal:** Students will successfully transition/re-enter the general curriculum learning environment from the alternative intervention program at each school campus.

#### Priority 12: Corrective Action, Restructuring, and State Directed Schools

**Goal:** The four schools at the Wynne District will show sufficient gains on the 2010 state assessments to maintain current school improvement status.

Priority 1: To provide District Federal Program Support to staff, students, and parents to increase student achievement.

1. The first grade total math scores on TLI interim assessments increased from 2010 to 2011. All strands showed an increase except for the area of geometry which decreased from 79% in 2010 to 74% in 2011. Increased emphasis on geometry will take place through daily routines and supplemental lessons that have been developed. There will be an increased emphasis on CGI strategies. Math intervention teachers will focus on TLI formative assessments to plan interventions. In 2nd grade, all math strands tested by TLI had a percentage at or above 77% for the 2010-2011 year. All strands were the same or higher than last year. The weakest strand was measurement, with a percentage of 77%. There will be increased emphasis on measurement with concrete manipulatives. There will be increased emphasis on CGI strategies. Math intervention teachers will use data from TLI formative The norm-referenced test for the 2010-2011 year was a new assessment. The percentiles for the average standard scores were as follows: Kindergarten- Total math, 78; First grade- Total Math, 56; Second grade- Total Math, 57. If the state continues to use ITBS as the norm-referenced test, trend data will be collected and progress will be monitored using this assessment. The Average Daily Attendance was as follows: 2008-2009: 95.6% 2009-2010: 95.4%; 2010-2011: 95.1% showing an improvement over three years. Over a three year period, the percentage of students of the combined population who scored proficient according to Arkansas cut scores on norm-referenced assessments (MAT-8 or SAT-10) were as follows: Math Kindergarten 2009-60% 2010-64% 2011-75% First Grade 2009-68% 2010-67% 2011-70% Second Grade 2009-65% 2010-67% 2011-63% Literacy Kindergarten 2009-60% 2010-65% 2011-81% First Grade 2009-68% 2010-70% 2011-75% Second Grade 2009-65% 2010-74% 2011-48% The performance of the combined population is above the state average. Data was analyzed for the same cohort of students who were in kindergarten in 2008 for a three year period. In the African American population, the number of students who scored at or above the 50th percentile when they were in 2nd grade increased by 12 percentage points over the number who scored at this level when in kindergarten. This was a positive trend. However, the number of first grade African American students in 2008 who scored at or above the 50th percentile declined in 2009, when these students were in 2nd grade. Data for economically disadvantaged students show an increase in the number of proficient for the 2009 kindergarten class and the 2009 first grade class over a two year period, with the 2010 second graders making an increase of 12 percentage points over their performance as first graders. Data from the IEP sub-population varies from year to year, with students in this group showing an increase in the number proficient in 2010.
2. Wynne Intermediate School (WIS) has received the status of Targeted Intensive Year V for the 2011-2012 school year. Grade 3 2011-92% 2010-91% 2009-86% Grade 4 2011-91% 2010-81% 2009-83% Grade 5 2011-80% 2010-77% 2009-77% The Combined Sub-population, African American, Caucasian, Economically Disadvantaged met status or safe harbor. However, the Special Education sub-population did not meet AYP. To meet the needs of the Students with Disabilities, third and fourth grade resource students will be placed in co-teach classrooms. In addition, the Closing the Achievement Gap Response to Intervention Model will be more systematic. Consultants with JBHM will plan with staff to make instructional improvements to meet the needs of students. 85% of all 3, 4, 5, grade students at Wynne Intermediate School (WIS) scored proficient and advanced on the 2010 Augmented Assessment. Grade 3 Percent Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 91 African American: 81 Caucasian: 95 Economic Disadvantaged: 89 Students with Disabilities: 52 Grade 4 Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 81 African American: 72 Caucasian: 86 Economic Disadvantaged: 74 Students with Disabilities: 28 Grade 5 Percent Proficient/ Advanced Combined Population: 77 African American: 58 Caucasian: 84 Economic Disadvantaged: 67 Students with Disabilities: 48 The 2010 Augmented Assessment data indicates that measurement is the lowest scoring strand in all three grades. Even though this is the lowest scoring strand, third grade and fifth grade students scored higher than the state average. WIS students scored lower on open response questions than multiple choice items. Geometry was the lowest scoring open response questions for third grade students and fifth grade students. The fourth grade students scored lower on the Data Analysis and Probability open response question, yet they were higher than the state average. Regarding the 2009 data, 3rd grade benchmark exam, 86% of the combined population of students scored at or above proficient on the math portion of the test. Of African American sub-populations, 74% scored proficient or advanced. 46% of students with disabilities passed the exam. Of the economically disadvantaged Group, 79% scored proficient or advanced. The most significant deficient areas were in Number Sense and Operations and Algebra. Open response continues to be weaker than multi-choice. Of fourth grade combined population students, 83% scored in the proficient or advanced category. 68% of the African American sub-population scored proficient or advanced on the 2009 benchmark exam. 41% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced, and 80% of the economically disadvantaged students were at or above the proficient level. A three year trend shows a steady increase of scores. The 2008 was 82%, and 2009 83%. The area of concern in math for 4th grade students is in measurement. There was a drop from 2008 to 2009 of 67% to 56%. Open response average continues to be lower than the multi-choice average. In 2009, 77% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the benchmark exam. The African Americans scored 70% in proficient and advanced levels. Students with disabilities scored 29% proficient or above. Economically disadvantaged students scored 69% proficient or advanced. Students scoring proficient or advanced in the combined population increased from 74% in 2008 to 75% in 2009. There was a decrease in all five strands in 2009. Measurement showed the most significant decrease. The data went from 63.8% in 2008 to 46.5% in 2009. Open response scores were weaker than multi-choice in all 5 strands in 2009. The 2010 SAT 10 Math Problem Solving indicates that the combined population students in our school were at or above the state average for Math Problem Solving in all sub groups of the exam except for the I.E.P. students in the 3rd and 4th grades. 3rd grade IEP students scored at the 16th percentile with the state score being at the 27th percentile. 4th grade IEP students were at the 23rd percentile compared to the state at the 34th percentile. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our combined population of 3rd grade students scored in the 60th percentile on math problem solving portion. Our African American subgroup scored in the 43rd percentile with economically disadvantaged students scoring in the 51st percentile. IEP students scored 26%. (Math problem solving was the only area tested for 3rd grade in math) 4th grade combined population students scored the same or better than 72% of the students in the Nation on the math problem solving section of the NRT portion of the 2009 Augmented Benchmark Exam. Our African

American students scored in the 54th percentile on the math problem solving. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 64th percentile and IEP students scored in the 46th percentile. On the 2009 math problem solving portion of the Augmented Benchmark Exam, our 5th grade students scored in the 77th percentile in the combined population segment of the test. 5th grade African American students scored 65% on this exam with economically disadvantaged students scoring 61%, and IEP students 25%. On the science portion of the 2009 NRT for the combined population, the 5th grade students scored in the 62nd percentile. African American students in this group scored in the 45th percentile, and economically disadvantaged students scored 50%, IEP students scored the same or above 28% of the students in the Nation. The 2009-2010 WIS CRT pre/post assessment data is noted: the following data is noted: third grade students scored an average of 23.4 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 21.9 on out of 40 on open response items on the post test. The fourth grade students ended the year with an average 21.6 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 22.5 on open response items. Fifth Grade students scored 19.6 out of 32 on the multiple choice items and 21.2 out of 40 on the open response items. All grade made significant improvement on the WIS CRT exam. In reviewing the results of the 2008-2009 Wynne Intermediate CRT post-test, the following data is noted: third grade students scored an average of 22 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 21.5 on out of 40 on open response items on the post test. The fourth grade students ended the year with an average 22.6 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 24.8 out of 40 on open response items. Fifth Grade students scored 20.9 out of 32 on the multiple choice items and 21.1 out of 40 on the open response items. All grade made significant improvement on the WIS CRT exam. Students with Disabilities are consistently scoring lower than the other sub-populations students especially in the area of Data Analysis, Probability and Geometry. Open response questions are still a challenge for the Students with Disabilities.

3. Wynne Intermediate School (WIS) has received the status of School Improvement Year V for the 2011-2012 school year. Grade 3 2011-82% 2010-75% 2009-69% Grade 4 2011-85% 2010-75% 2009-69% Grade 5 2011-77% 2010-74% 2009-66% The Combined Sub-population, Caucasian, and Economic Disadvantaged met status or safe harbor. However, the Special Education sub-population did not meet AYP. To meet the needs of the Students with Disabilities, third and fourth grade resource students will be placed in co-teach classrooms. In addition, the Closing the Achievement Gap Response to Intervention Model will be systematic. Consultants with JBHM will plan with staff to make instructional improvements to meet the needs of students. On the 2010-11 Arkansas Augmented Assessment 81.8% of all students enrolled at WIS scored proficient or advanced in literacy. The grade level scores are as follows: Grade 3 Percent Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 82, African American: 64.6, Caucasian: 91, Economic Disadvantaged: 76, Students with Disabilities: 36, Grade 4 Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 85, African American: 73, Caucasian: 90, Economic Disadvantaged: 81, Students with Disabilities: 48, Grade 5 Percent Proficient/ Advanced Combined Population: 77, African American: 60, Caucasian: 85, Economic Disadvantaged: 69, Students with Disabilities: 0 Third grade students scored higher on the multiple choice items than the open response items. Content Reading is the lowest scoring multiple choice passage type for third grade; however, this score was significantly higher than the state average. Additionally, third graders were more successful on the multiple choice writing items than the open response writing responses. Fourth grade students scored higher on the literacy multiple choice items than the open response items. Practical multiple choice passage types were the lowest literacy skill area; however the average score was higher than the state average. Fifth grade students scored higher on the open response reading items than the multiple choice items. Content was the lowest scoring passage. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills Assessment was the NRT given in 2010-2011 and we do not have any established baseline data. Third grade students scored 55% at above the national percentile range in reading comprehension. Fourth grade students 55.3% and fifth grade students scored 45.8%. African American students scored lower than the Caucasian students in all three grades. 2010 SAT-10-Reading Comprehension In the area of Reading Comprehension, all groups scored at or above the state average except for our Hispanic Males who were below the state in 3rd and 5th grades. Our 3rd grade Hispanic Males scored 24% compared to 51% in the state and our 5th grade Males in the same group ranked in the 67th percentile which is slightly lower than the state at the 70th percentile. Our IEP students scored below the state in 3rd grade with a score in the 67th% compared to 20th% and 4th grade we scored at the 20th % and the state average was in the 19th. Our Free and Reduced sub population scored slightly below the state in 4th and 5th grades with our 4th grade students scoring in the 55th % and the state in the 57th %. In 5th grade on this portion of the exam, our Free and Red students scored 44% compared to the state scoring 47% 2010 SAT 10 Comprehensive Language Our combined population on the NRT for Comprehensive Language scored below the state average in 3rd and 4th grades and equal to the state in 5th grade. In looking at our sub groups on this portion of the exam, we were slightly below the state average in all sub groups except for our Hispanic students in the 3rd and 5th grades who scored considerably higher. Our Hispanic students scored 44% in 3rd grade compared to the state average of 29%. In 5th grade our Hispanic population scored 54% and the state scored 39%. Our IEP students were below the state scores in 3rd and 4th grades. IEP students in 3rd grade scored 10% and the state scored 14% and 4th grade IEP students scored 9% compared to the state score of 14%. Our 5th grade IEP students were slightly above the state average with a score of 22% and the state 19%. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Third Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 43rd percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 26th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 11th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 34th percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Third Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 36th percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 21st percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 10th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 27th percentile rank. Overall, Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Third Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Fourth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 58th percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 40th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 29th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 51st percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Fourth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 44th percentile rank. Of that population,

the African American Students scored in the 25th percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 12th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 27th percentile rank. Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Fourth Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Fifth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 52nd percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 36th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 5th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 41st percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Fifth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 43rd percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 33rd percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 14th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 36th percentile rank. Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Fifth Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups except for the IEP subgroup as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT.

4. Benchmark-6th Grade Mathematics Exam 2008 - # Tested and Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced 218 Students: 78.4% of Combined Students 58 Students: 63.8% of African/American Students 157 Students: 83.4% of Caucasian Students 123 Students: 69.9% of Economically Disadvantaged Students 1 Student: 100% of LEP Students 24 Students: 25.0% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (215 Students Tested) 173 Students: 80.4% of Combined Students 46 Students: 66% of African American Students 128 Students: 89% of Caucasian Students 98 Students: 75 % of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 17 Students: 44% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified area for the combined population was: Measurement in Open Response. Data Analysis in Multiple Choice. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (192 Students Tested) 163 Students: 85% of Combined Students 52 Students: 73% of African American Students 109 Students: 92% of Caucasian Students 90 Students: 78% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 6 Students: 38% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified area for the combined population was: Measurement in Open Response. Data Analysis in Multiple Choice. 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 227 Students: 78% of Combined Students 72 Students: 61% of African American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 151 Students: 82% of Caucasian Students 144 Students: 67% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 38 Students: 26% of Students with Disabilities Benchmark-7th Grade Mathematics Exam 2008 - # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 76.2% of Combined Students 80 Students: 56.3% of African/American Students 160 Students: 85.6% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 65.4% of Economically Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 17.9% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (214 Students Tested) 176 Students: 82% of Combined Students 41 Students: 76% of African American Students 131 Students: 84% of Caucasian Students 86 Students: 74% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 4 Students: 19% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Number and Operations in Open Response. Geometry in Multiple Choice. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (211 Students Tested) 179 Students: 84% of Combined Students 46 Students: 73% of African American Students 132 Students: 89% of Caucasian Students 97 Students: 78% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 12 Students: 35% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Data Analysis/Probability in Open Response. Data Analysis/Probability in Multiple Choice. 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 193 Students: 87.0% of Combined Students 80 Students: 79.0% of African American Students 3 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 119 Students: 91.0% of Caucasian Students 112 Students: 83.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A % of LEP Students 16 Students: 32.0% of Students with Disabilities. Benchmark-8th Grade Mathematics Exam 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 41.1% of African/American Students 172 Students: 83.1% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 52.5% of Economically Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 17.6% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (257 Students Tested) 187 Students: 72% of Combined Students 45 Students: 54% of African American Students 138 Students: 83% of Caucasian Students 89 Students: 60% of Econ. Disadvantaged Student 4 Students: 15% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Number/Operations and Geometry strands with both Multiple Choice & Open Response. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (216 Students Tested) 170 Students: 79% of Combined Students 34 Students: 64% of African American Students 133 Students: 83% of Caucasian Students 79 Students: 69% of Econ Disadvantaged Students 3 Students: 14% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Number/Operations in Open Response. Data Analysis/Probability in Multiple Choice. 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 74.0% of Combined Students 66 Students: 65.0% of African American Students 1 Student: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 141 Students: 77.0 % of Caucasian Students 125 Students: 71.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 13.0% of Students with Disabilities ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2008 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 61.8% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 56.7% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 63.6% ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2009 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 67% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 63% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 75% ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2010 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 71% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 66% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 77% ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2011 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 57% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 59% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 60%
5. Comprehensive Language 49% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 41% Comprehensive Language 46% Iowa Test of Basic Skills Achievement Test Scores 2010 administration National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE: Gr 8 (combined) Reading Comprehension 62% Comprehensive Language 53% Gr 7 (combined) Reading Comprehension 52% Comprehensive Language 46% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 46% Comprehensive Language 47% Stanford-10 Achievement Test Scores 2009 administration National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE: Gr 8 (combined) Reading Comprehension 48.3% Comprehensive Language 43.8%

Supporting Data:

Gr 7 (combined) Reading Comprehension 52.5% Comprehensive Language 48.3% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 45% Comprehensive Language 44.6% 1-A. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam 2008-9 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 students: 67.9% of Combined Students 58 students: 51.7% of African/American Students 2 students: 100% of Hispanic Students 160 students: 71.9% of Caucasian Students 122 students: 55.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 students: N/A of LEP Students 24 students: 8.3% of Students with Disabilities 2009-10 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (215 Students Tested) 138 Students: 64% of Combined Students 32 Students: 46% of African American Students 105 Students: 73% of Caucasian Students 71 Students: 55% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (192 Students Tested) 148 Students: 77% of Combined Students 46 Students: 65% of African American Students 100 Students: 84% of Caucasian Students 80 Students: 70% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-11 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 227 Students: 62% of Combined Students 72 Students: 48.0% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 151 Students: 68% of Caucasian Students 144 Students: 54% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 38 Students: 13% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Literary Passage and writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response was Content Passage and Content/Style in Writing. 1-B. Benchmark-7th Grade Literacy Exam 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 60.9% of Combined Students 80 Students: 37.5% of African/American Students 5 Students: 80% of Hispanic Students 114 Students: 71.7% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 48.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 7.0% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (214 Students Tested) 154 Students: 72% of Combined Students 28 Students: 52% of African American Students 122 Students: 78% of Caucasian Students 68 Students: 58% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (211 Students Tested) 152 Students: 72% of Combined Students 39 Students: 61% of African American Students 112 Students: 76% of Caucasian Students 81 Students: 65% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 7 Students: 21% of Students with Disabilities 2010-11 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 193 Students: 66% of Combined Students 70 Students: 60% of African American Students 3 Students: 66.0% of Hispanic Students 119 Students: 69% of Caucasian Students 112 Students: 58% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 16 Students: 6% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Literary Passage and writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response in Literary Passage and Content/Style in Writing. 1-C. Benchmark-8th Grade Literacy Exam 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 45.2% of African/American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 172 Students: 81.4% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 56.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 10.7% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (257 Students Tested) 176 Students: 68% of Combined Students 44 Students: 53% of African American Students 127 Students: 76% of Caucasian Students 84 Students: 59% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (216 Students Tested) 185 Students: 86% of Combined Students 38 Students: 72% of African American Students 144 Students: 90% of Caucasian Students 91 Students: 80% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 3 Students: 14% of Students with Disabilities 2010-2011 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 72% of Combined Students 66 Students: 59% of African American Students 1 Student: 0% of Hispanic Students 141 Students: 77% of Caucasian Students 125 Students: 64% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 16% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response in Literary and Content Passage and Content/Style domain in Writing.

6. In 2010-2011, 92% of the ALGEBRA AND 81% OF THE GEOMETRY STUDENTS SCORED PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED THUS MEETING STATUS. In 2011, 92% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 81% on EOC Geometry, 86% of African American students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 65% on EOC Geometry, 93% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 88% on EOC Geometry, 86% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 72% on EOC Geometry, N/A LEP students, 0.0% of Students with Disabilities scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 0.0% on EOC Geometry, The lowest identified areas of weakness for the combined populations were: Non-Linear Functions and Language of Algebra on Algebra open response questions, and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions and Triangles on Geometry open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Non-Linear Functions and Language of Algebra on Algebra open response, and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions and Triangles on Geometry open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for Caucasian students were: Language of Algebra on Algebra open response, and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions on Geometry open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for economically disadvantaged students were: Non-Linear Functions and Language of Algebra on Algebra and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions and Triangles on Geometry open response questions. In 2010, 87% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 82% on EOC Geometry, 77% of African American students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 50% on EOC Geometry, 91% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 92% on EOC Geometry, 83% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 67% on EOC Geometry, N/A LEP students. The lowest identified areas of weakness for the combined populations were: Solve equations and inequalities of Algebra on open response questions, and Measurement in Geometry on open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Solving equations and inequalities in Algebra, and Measurement in Geometry on open response questions. In 2009, 84% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 70% on EOC Geometry, 67% of African American students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 50% on EOC Geometry, 89% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 78.0% on EOC Geometry, 73% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 56.0% on EOC Geometry, N/A LEP students, The lowest identified areas of weakness for the combined

populations were: Non-Linear Functions of Algebra on open response questions, and Relationship of two and three dimensions for Geometry on open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Non Linear Functions in Algebra, and Relationships between two and three dimensions in Geometry on open response questions. Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITBS): 2011 Math: 60.5% of all students scored above the 50th percentile in Concepts and Problem Solving while only 30% scored above the 50th percentile in Computation. In 2010, 80% of combined students in the 9th grade scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Mathematics. In 2009, 77.6% of combined students in the 9th grade scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Mathematics. In 2008, 72.5% of combined students in the 9th grade scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Mathematics. The average ACT score in 10-11 for all students was 19.5 in Math, 18.8 in English, 19.2 in Reading and 19.3 Composite. 09-10 for all students in Math was 20.0; in 08-09, 21.1; and in 07-08, 20.1, over the same period of time. For African American students it was 16.9, 16.9, and 17.3. The percent of students meeting college readiness benchmark scores according to ACT in Mathematics in 2011 was 35%, 2010 was 33%, in 2009 was 42% in 2008 was 33%, in 2007 35%. For African American student for the same period it was 9%, 14%, 14%, and 20%.

7. WYNNE HIGH SCHOOL IS Targeted Intensive Improvement (TII-4) FOR LITERACY Because in 2010-2011 Wynne High School's COMBINED POPULATION SCORED 62.5% PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED AND OUR AFRICAN AMERICAN GROUP IMPROVED TO 39.2%. Our economically disadvantaged group improved to 50.6% proficient and advanced up from to 41.8% proficient and advanced. The lowest identified areas of weakness in reading for the combined population, which includes the African-American population, the Economically Disadvantaged population, and the Students with Disabilities population, were the literary and content passages. In 2010-11, 61% of the combined students scored at or above proficient on the GR 11 Literacy Exam, 39% of African American students scored at or above proficient, 71% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient, 49% economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient, N/A of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas of weakness in writing for the Combined Population was the multiple choice questions with a 71.9% average; African-American population with a 61.5% average; Economically Disadvantaged population with a 66.1% average. The other areas of weakness for the African-American population were content and style with an average of 71.9%. The other areas of weakness for the Economically Disadvantaged population were content with an average of 76.0 and style with an average of 76.2%. In 2009, 56% of the combined students scored at or above proficient on the GR 11 Literacy Exam, 33% of African American students scored at or above proficient, 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient, 35% disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient, N/A of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas of weakness for combined population students were content passage and practical passage open response questions. The lowest identifies areas of weakness for African American students were content passage open response questions. The lowest identified area of weakness for Caucasian students were content passage open response questions. The lowest identified areas of weakness of students who are economically disadvantaged were content passage open response questions. The lowest identified area of weakness for students with disabilities were content passage open response questions. In 2008, 48% of the combined students scored at or above proficient on the GR 11 Literacy Exam, 14% of African American students scored at or above proficient, 59.9% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient, 28.9% of economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient, N/A of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas of weakness for combined population students were: Content passage and practical passage open response questions, The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Content passage open response questions, The lowest identified area of weakness for Caucasian students were content passage open response questions, The lowest identified areas of weakness of students who are economically disadvantaged were: content passage open response questions, The lowest identified area of weakness for students with disabilities were: Content passage open response questions. Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITBS): 2011 Literacy: 48% of all students scored above the 50th percentile in Vocabulary and 50.2% scored above the 50th percentile in Comprehension. IN 2010, 44% OF COMBINED STUDENTS SCORED AT OR ABOVE THE 50TH PERCENTILE OF THE SAT 10 IN READING. 20% of African American students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. 53% of Caucasian students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2009, 44% of combined students scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Literacy. 15% of African American students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading and 28% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Language. 57% of Caucasian students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading and 55% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Language. 29% of the Free and Reduced Lunch students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading and 36% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Language. In 2008, 48.9% of combined students scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Literacy. In 2007, 46% of combined students scored at or above the 50th percentile on the ITBS Literacy. 17.7% of African American students scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading, 30% in language. 60% of Caucasian students scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading, 64% in language. 27% of Socio Economic Deprived students scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading, and 36% in language. 9% of Students with Disabilities students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Vocabulary (select best synonym); Reading Comprehension (Analysis Generalization – identify speaker viewpoint), The lowest identified areas for the African Americans were: Reading Comprehension (vocabulary), The lowest identified areas for the Caucasians were: Reading Comprehension (vocabulary) (spelling), The lowest identified areas for the Socio Economic Deprived: Reading Comprehension, The lowest identified areas for the Students with Disabilities were: Reading Comprehension (vocabulary) (spelling). In 2010 the average ACT score in English was 19.8 and for Reading 19.6 and a 19.9 composite. For Caucasian students English was 22.0 and Reading was 21.3 and the composite was 21.6 The average ACT score for African American students in English was 15.7, Reading was 16.4 with a composite of 16.9. In 2009 the average ACT score in English was 21.1. The average composite score for Caucasians was 22.4 in English and 22.2 in Reading, while the average score for African-Americans was 16.2 in English and 15.8 in Reading. In 2008 the average ACT score in English was 20.5. The average composite score for Caucasians was 22.1 in English and 21.3 in Reading, while the average score for African-Americans was 17.4 in English and 16.7 in Reading. In 2007 the average ACT score in English was 21.0 in reading 20.3 The average composite score for African-Americans was 17.0 in English and

16.7 in Reading. In 2006 the average ACT score in English was 19.5, in reading 19.7 while the average composite score for African American students was 17.8.

- 8. The Graduation Rate: In 2010 the graduation rate was 89.0 in 2009 89.0%, in 2008 89.38% District Attendance Rate: 2010 94.3% in 2009 94.8% in 2008 94.7%

- Goal** To provide students, staff, and parents support in order for students to learn at their maximum potential in literacy and mathematics and to foster an orderly, safe, and healthy learning environment.
- Benchmark** The number of students on the Primary Benchmark Spring 2011 Exams in grades 3-5 performing below grade level will decrease and the number scoring above the proficient level will continue to increase to maintain statewide AYP goals.
- Benchmark** The number of students in grades K-5 scoring above the 50th percentile on the state required NORM Reference Testing will increase in both literacy and mathematics on the spring 2012 exam.
- Benchmark** Students in the Wynne School District will acquire the knowledge and attitudes necessary to build a strong foundation for a healthy and safe life style. Students will develop positive character traits and appropriate school behaviors which will support an increase in their over-all achievement.

Intervention: School Improvement Support will be provided utilizing comprehensive standards based literacy and mathematics program based on scientific research.

Scientific Based Research: Boushey, G., and Moser, J. (2006). the daily 5: Fostering Literacy Independence In The Elementary Grades. Portland, MA: Stenhouse Publisher. Faber, S. (2006). How To Teach Reading When You're Not A Reading Teacher. Nashville, TN: Incentive Publications. Reading Recovery Council of North America. (2004). Standards and Guidelines of Reading Recovery in the United States (4th ed.). Worthington, OH: Clay. Mokros, J., Berle-Carman, M., Rubin, A. & O'Neil, K. (2006). Investigations in Number, Data, and Space: Advancing the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics. Retrieved May 31, 2006, from <http://investigations.terc.edu/research/eval-2.cfm>. The National Council Of Teachers Of Mathematics. (2006). Curriculum Focal Points for Pre-kindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics: A Quest for Coherence. Reston, VA: NCTM. Lovin, L. H., & Van de Walle, J. A. (2006). Teaching Student-Centered Mathematics Grades K-3. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc. Bradley, D. M., & Shockey, T. L. (2006). An Engaging Puzzle to Explore: Algebraic Generalizations. Mathematics Teacher, 99(8), 532-537. Marzano, R. J. (2007). The Art and Science of Teaching: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction. Alexandria, VA. ACSD. Winebrenner, S. (2006). Teaching Kids with Learning Difficulties in the Regular Classroom: Ways to Challenge & Motivate Struggling Students to Achieve Proficiency with Required Standards. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing Inc.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>1. Provide support to the buildings ACSIIP for development and implementation of interventions listed with in the programs to support students learning at their maximum potential. Professional Development opportunities will be afforded to staff and parents on site, in state, regional, and on the national level - such as Common Core, Smart Start, Smart Step, Reading Recovery, ELLA, ELF, ARA, Literacy, NCTM, PPBS, The Learning Institute, Investigation Training, AAIM, ASCD, AASA, AASL, AAEA, AASSP, AAESP, AAFC, ARCA, Technology, HSTI, ISTI, NCLB, Character, Poverty, Love and Logic, TI/AAFC, NAESP, NMSAC, NASSP, NSVA, ARSBA, NASSC, NAESC, ARSCA, ADE Workshops, Parent Educator Conferences, and contracted services to presenters/consultants: such as Dr. Linda Griffith, Elaine Sparks, Writing Academy staff ... (Professional Development for Title I Staff and additional funds for professional development is added to the Primary and Intermediate buildings to hire Literacy and Mathematics coaches above the required 10% professional development from Title I FUNDS). The professional development will be measured by the impact made on students as recorded on their state assessments. Funded in buildings. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Programs Coordinator, Debbie Heath, GR K-2 Principal; Sandra Hollaway, GR 3-5 Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>3. The Learning Institute will provide "Chunk Tests" for grades one through five TI schoolwide program and grade six through eleven for students throughout the school year. Building level curriculum will be aligned to state SLE's and Common Core. The formative assessments will be used for identifying students with deficiencies and allow for point in time remediation. Professional development, research and data will be provided for staff utilizing the Learning Institute. Title I, Title VI, NSLA and local funds will be combined to pay the fees of the academic evaluations, data clerk salary for scanning, tracking, and reporting student achievement, and</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Kathy Lee, TI Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>other cost associated through the use of The Learning Institute. See individual building plans for budget expense and program evaluation.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>2. To maintain and increase student achievement the staff of the Wynne School District currently meets the state standards for "highly qualified status" and will continue to meet the standards. K-2 campus will implement Arkansas Common Core Standards in 2011-12 and grades 3-8 will move toward full implementation in the 2011-13. Grades 9-12 will fully implement CCSS in 2013-14.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Carl Easley,                  Interim Superintendent;                  Kathy Lee,                  Asst. Superintendent</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2011                  End:                  06/30/2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>4. The Wynne School District will recruit and maintain a highly qualified teaching staff. Select staff members of the district will attend recruitment seminars and participate in state and area recruitments.                  Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Carl Easley,                  Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2011                  End:                  06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>5. Sixty hours of professional development designed to meet state requirements will be provided by the Wynne School District Staff, Outside Providers, and Crowley's Ridge Cooperative Staff. Parent Involvement Professional Development will be present two hours to teachers and three hours to district administrators at no expense to the Title I program. Teachers, administrators, School Board Members, and classified school employees are involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of professional development activities. (Joint Leadership TEAM MTGS)                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Carl Easley,                  Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2011                  End:                  06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>6. District ACTAAP scores along with building assessment data will be analyzed and charted to show student performance levels to guide revisions in curriculum and instructional practices. Building level teams led by academic coaches will disseminate and review analyses of the data with building committees and district leadership team (JLT).                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Carl Easley,                  Interim Superintendent;                  Kathy Lee,                  Asst. Sup't</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2011                  End:                  06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>8. The Title I program will be developed and evaluated by administrators, teachers, parents, and community representatives. A Federal Programs Committee is formulated to evaluate the Title I program semi-annually. Annual meetings will be held to inform parents and community of the Title I Rules and Regulations to add an additional time to review SI school improvement plans and to make suggestions for 2011-2012. An open forum for staff, parents, and community is set for Federal Programs Coordinator to present an overview of the ACSIP on September 26, 2011, at the Wynne School Board Meeting. The school board will vote to authorize the Superintendent permission to sign assurances as required by Section 9306 to submit an (ACSIP) Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan as required by 9305. A report to patrons will be scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on September 26, 2011, and shown on Channel 17. Parents input in the curriculum will be welcomed and encouraged. All parents will be made aware of school funding, school performance status (SI), curriculum used in the schools, TI programs, student assessments, and ACTAPP. Parents, staff, students and community leaders are asked to participate in a Title I on-line or</p>	<p>Carl Easley,                  Interim Superintendent;                  Kathy Lee,                  Federal Program Coordinator</p>	<p>Start:                  09/20/2011                  End:                  06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>paper survey/needs assessment to support the program of study and determine its effectiveness each year.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>7. The school district will research Supplemental Educational Services to explore options for parents. The Title I Coordinator will conduct parent information sessions on available providers at an open meeting on August 25, 2011. In 2010-11 over 90 parents attended the SES informational session. Title I funds will be SET ASIDE to equal 20% of the Title I allotment (\$846893.00 allocation + 21411.66 reallocation= 173661.00) and will be established to support the NCLB ruling of CHOICE for students/parents that exercise their school choice option for TRANSPORTATION AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES from TI schools in School Improvement to attend the school of their choice not in School Improvement or receive services from an SES provider. Choice is not an option for the K-12 students. Of the 20% -1% (1737.00) will be budgeted to support materials/supplies and postage for parental notification. Public School Choice/SES notifications were mailed on August 01, 2011, parents were notified of the K-5 School Improvement status WSII-5-R; grades 6-8 SD-7; and grades 9-12 TII-4. The Wynne Intermediate grades 3-5 and Wynne Primary grades K-2 feeder school, Wynne Junior High grades 6-8, and Wynne High School grades 9-12 are schoolwide Title I schools in School Improvement where TI funds will be used for parents to select supplemental services (SES) for their children from the approved Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) Supplemental Educational Services Providers List. Students from low income families with the greatest academic need will receive SES services first. If funds are not available for all students requesting supplemental services a rank order system will be implemented to identify students in greatest need of literacy and mathematic services to reduce gaps in academic achievement.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Kathy Lee,                  Federal Programs Coordinator</p>	<p>Start:                  08/01/2011                  End:                  06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$171924.00                  Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$1737.00  <hr/>                 ACTION BUDGET: \$173661</p>

Total Budget:	\$173661
---------------	----------

Intervention: The Wynne School District will provide adequate administrative and curriculum support and services to monitor and give guidance and evaluation of activities to strengthen the collaborative effort to increase student achievement of low performing children.

Scientific Based Research: Cowan, K. T. and Edwards, C.J. (2009, November). The New Title I: The Changing Landscape of Accountability. 6th Edition. Washington, DC: Thompson Publishing Group, Inc. Fielding, L., Kerr, & N. Rosier, P. (2007). Annual Growth For All Students: Catch-Up Growth For Those Who Are Behind. Kennewick, WA: New Foundation Press, Inc. Reeves, D.B. (2010). Transforming Professional Development Into Student Results. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). School, Family, and Community Partnerships. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. Edwards, C. D. (2005). How to Handle A hard-to-handle kid: A Parents' Guide to Understanding and Changing Problem Behaviors. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing, Inc. Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>8. Hire a .50 FTE Parent Coordinator Sherry Breckenridge from TITLE I FUNDS in grades K-5 and a .50 FTE NSLA Parent Coordinator K-12 for Wynne School District (NSLA budget is in building level funds). The parent coordinator will work closely with parents, parent facilitators, students, teachers, administrators, and community agencies to build a strong education network to advance children and</p>	<p>Kathy Lee,                  Federal Program Coordinator;                  Carl Easley,                  Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2011                  End:                  06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$12900.00                  Title I - Employee Benefits: \$3122.63</p>

<p>families. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$16022.63</p>
<p>9. Provide parental materials and supplies in the parent center to promote parental involvement that support student achievement in literacy, mathematics, and parenting education. Materials and supplies will also be purchased to support the district parent coordinator, PAC meetings, parent workshops, parent nights, and other related parent involvement needs from TITLE I FUNDS. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$1453.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$1453</p>
<p>5. Parent Coordinator, parents, teachers, and administrators travel expenses for state conferences to collaborate educational efforts to build a strong bond between child, home, parent and school, are provided by Title I and district funds. Professional development will be provided with TI and district funds to enhance current school programs and encourage parental involvement in the overall academic education of children and promote a well rounded student in a safe and orderly environment. Travel expense will be provided to parent coordinator for home-visits to link families and staff to school experiences. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$700.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$700</p>
<p>7. Pursuant to Section 724C of the McKinney-Vento HOMELESS Assistance Act, as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the Wynne School District Administration works closely with students, parents, schools, shelters, and involves the community in support to ensure homeless students are identified and are offered a consistent educational experience during transitional time. The district has selected a HOMELESS LIAISON, Sherry Breckenridge, to ensure students in homeless situations are identified, enrolled, and assisted in receiving educational services, and have transportation to and from school at parent request. Students receives the same special programs and services as provided to other students, including GT, special education, migrant education, special activities, and vocational education. The homeless liaison works closely with the building parent facilitators, principals, teachers, RNs, and caseworker to identify, provide food, clothing, shelter, school supplies, academic and emotional support, health screenings, and medical attention. Community Resources (DHS, Good Shepard Center, Wal-Mart, Arkansas Rice Depot, church groups and civic organizations, school staff, and medical groups partner with the district to identify and provide assistance to the homeless. Funds are set aside through district and Title I along with community financial support to assist the families experiencing homelessness, a crisis affecting every aspect of the students' lives. Title I staff will work in collaboration with liaison and community agencies to meet the homeless families needs. (funds allocated in building plans for district and community set asides). Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$400.00 Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$600.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$1000</p>
<p>6. The district will hire from Title I funds a Federal Program Coordinator .40 FTE Kathy Lee, 1.0 FTE Secretary Support Staff Melinda Haines to oversee the implementation of the schoolwide Title I program to collect data, secure learning programs, perform secretarial duties, program assessment, training and</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent, Kathy Lee, Federal Program</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central Office</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$64177.00 Title I - Employee \$16990.00</p>

technology support to the Title I Schools. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Coordinator			Benefits:  ACTION BUDGET: \$81167
4. Office supplies and materials will be provided to support the Title I district efforts, purchase text, professional literature, references, postage, miscellaneous materials, and supplies to support the Title I programs from TI funds. Action Type: Collaboration	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$1900.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$1900
10. Equipment repairs for administrative office and district Title I program and parent center will be paid from Title I and district funds. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	Title I - Purchased Services: \$400.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$400.00 General Revenue: \$800.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$1600
11. Federal Program Coordinator, TI Secretarial Staff, District Support and Administrative Staff will attend area, regional, state, and national conferences, workshops, trainings, and visit model programs in support of NCLB. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kathy Lee, Federal Programs Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	Title I - Purchased Services: \$1800.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$1800
12. Indirect Services the use of district facilities, resources, and bookkeeping staff to support the Title I program at current recommended rate is not requested for refund from Title I for 2011-12. NO charge to TI program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
13. A comprehensive parental involvement program aligned to ACT 307, 397, 603, and section 1118 of Title I will be implemented at each campus within the district. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Title Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
14. To satisfy the Title I 95% reserve rule of 1% allocated funds for parental involvement funds are provided for parental programs to support student achievement in the Wynne Primary and Wynne Intermediate plans. The dollars funded through Title I is placed as salary to the Title I Parent Coordinator and Title I Secretary along with expenses to manage the two areas in an excess to exceed the 95% reserve rule of 1% (8508). Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Central Office</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
15. Title I funds will be set aside to assist children that are in need of materials, supplies, clothing, health care, and other support that may apply to Title I children. District and Title I staff will work in collaboration with community and state agencies to meet the children's needs. Title I funds will only be used once all other state and community resources have been exhausted. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title I - Purchased Services: \$300.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$300.00 Local Revenue: \$500.00 General

<p>Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness</p>				<p>Revenue: \$500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$1600</p>
<p>16. The Parent Advisory Committee of parents, teachers, administrators, and community leaders, will evaluate, review, and make recommendations to improve the Title I Parent Involvement Policy annually. The TI Parent Involvement Policy will be designed to improve parent participation and decrease barriers that hinder participation by parents. The TI Policy will be signed and approved by district superintendent. The Title I Policy will be posted on the Wynne School District website and distributed to parents in the Family Information Packets. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Programs Coordinator; Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>17. An annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the Title I Parental Involvement Plan and TI District Parent Involvement Policy will be conducted by the Parent Advisory Committee, including a representative of district alumni. The evaluation will be designed to determine whether the academic quality of the school has improved, parent participation has increased, and barriers exist that hinder participation by parents. The evaluation will be conducted using regular on-line and hard copy parent surveys regarding school practices and the Title I Program. The results will be summarized by the technology staff and used in planning by the building teams. Notification of school improvement status will be mailed to parents 14 days before the first day of teacher- student interaction days (August 01, 2011). Evening and day parent visitation times will be scheduled twice during the fall and once during the spring, in addition to parent day and night programs. Publish the email addresses and conference times of teachers in the parent information packet, monthly calendars, and building web-link to promote two-way communication between school and home. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator; Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>18. The district will monitor the Title I campuses' parent/school compact. Appropriate data, student profiles, AIP/IRI's, school improvement status, and school compacts will be signed by all parents, students, teachers, and principals at Title I school-wide campuses. Time certifications will be signed and collected for audit. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Programs Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>19. In 2010-2011 a total of 255 students participated in Supplemental Educational Services (SES) programs with three outside providers with Title I, TI ARRA, district, and NSLA funds. Two programs were provided 10/27/10-12/15/10 and 2/8/11-3/30/11. Students were placed in areas of greatest academic need based on multiple factors: economic status, parental request, benchmark assessments, SAT-10, DIBELS, and pre-assessments (CRT exams). In 2011-2012 the district will conduct one program in the fall starting in October 2011 ending January 2012. If funds are available a second program will start in February 2012. The district will monitor student progress of those taking advantage of the SES programs through ADE data bank, on-site visits, attendance records, and written progress reports from the providers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Programs Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 08/01/2011 End: 04/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
2. Update technology to support the Title I district program. Replace outdated software to track reports, forms, Title I staff records and TI student progress and trainings. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	Title I - Materials & \$500.00 Supplies:  ACTION BUDGET: \$500
3. Support Title I secretary in the tracking of SES, Title I student progress, TI parent involvement, ACSIP, and other important Title I daily responsibilities. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Office</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. The Wynne School District requested funds from the Title I, Part A 1003(a) and Title I, ARRA 1003(a) School Improvement Grant. The grant was written for the Wynne Primary K-2 and the Wynne Intermediate GR 3-5 both schools are Whole School Intensive Improvement WSII-5-R School Improvement. The funds from the grant will be divided between the two campuses at \$52,397.00 each with a total for the SIG1003a in the amount of \$104,794.00. The grant will support the restructuring efforts of K-5 campuses to build the infrastructure, to help analyze school leadership, provide guidance with CWT's, deliver professional development, and technical assistance to address schools' JBHM commitment in supporting Response to Intervention (RTI), Struggling Learners, and Coaches Training. Data Walls will be displayed to track the progress of student achievement. Principals will present findings from weekly CWT's to Superintendents. In addition the district administrators will review JBHM timed work reports to follow the progress of each scheduled visit. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Kathy Lee, Assistant Superintendent	Start: 03/01/2010 End: 12/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$107742.63

Priority 2: Students and staff in the Wynne School District will gain knowledge and attitudes needed to develop appropriate behaviors to promote the foundation for a productive, non-violent, healthy, safe, and drug free life.

1. According to cycle 7 Annual Discipline Reports, Out-of-School Suspension for the past three years are: 2007-2008 Primary and Intermediate combined all office referrals in one category for 2006-07, Junior High 47, High School 127. 2005-2006 Primary 09, Intermediate 16, Junior High 64, High School 141; 2004-2005 Primary 0, Intermediate 6, Junior High 64, High School 67; 2003-2004 Primary 3, Intermediate 11, Junior High 61, High School 83.
2. On the cycle 7 Annual Discipline Report the number of office referrals for Disorderly Conduct/Insubordination are: 2009 Primary 350, Intermediate 239, Junior High 150, High School 554; 2008 Primary 240, Intermediate 259, Junior High 419, High School 566; 2007 Primary 251, Intermediate 265, Junior High 473, High School 579; 2006 Primary 86, Intermediate 177, Junior High 761, High School 574; 2004-2005 Primary 86, Intermediate 151, Junior High 883, High School 329; & 2003-2004 Primary 153, Intermediate 143, Junior High 1132, High School 380.
3. According to surveys conducted by CDC, the percentage of students in Arkansas who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property by someone for the year: 2007 was 28.1%, 2005 was 29.2%, 2001 was 21.1%, and 1999 was 20.8%. The percentage of Arkansas students who had at least one drink of alcohol during their life: 2007 was 73.9%, 2005 was 76.0%, 2001 was 79.6%, and 1999 was 79.6%.
4. Students in the Wynne High School and Junior High participated in the Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment (APNA) Survey and were included in the State Report 2008. The percentage of students who perceive that using three categories of substances places people at "Great Risk" TABLE Combined District Cigarettes Lifetime Use - 2008 was 33.5, 2007 was 35.2%, 2006 was 40.2%, 2005 was 53.7%; Marijuana Lifetime Use - 2008 was 14.2%; 2007 was 17.0%, 2006 was 19.6%, 2005 was 28.3%; Alcohol Lifetime Use - 2008 was 51.5%, 2007 was 49.0%, 2006 was 51.7%, 2005 was 79.4%.
5. Wynne High School Graduation Rate: 2008-2009 89.38 2008-2007 93.2 2006-2007 83.6

Supporting Data:

Goal Students in the Wynne School District will acquire the knowledge and attitudes needed to improve the behavioral climate at each campus. Students will develop positive character traits, reduce truancy, and acquire the skills necessary for a healthy, safe and drug free life.

Benchmark The number of office referrals for inappropriate school behavior and drug related infractions will be reduced 10% by the end of the 2010-2011 school term.

Intervention: Implement strategies for developing and encouraging positive character traits and building a healthy, safe, orderly, and drug free life. District level program will be evaluated in building Walk-Throughs and evaluations of district staff.

Scientific Based Research: Dwyer, K., Jackson, S., & Osher, D. (2004). *Safe, Supportive, and Successful Schools: Step by Step*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West. Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W., Sager, N., & Short-Camilli, C. (2004). *Bully-Proofing Your School: Working with Victims and Bullies in Elementary Schools*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West. Howard, L., & Sprick, R. (1997). *The Teacher's Encyclopedia of Behavior Management: 100 Problems/500 Plans for grades K-9*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West. Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services Division of Health. (2005). *Arkansas County-Specific Prevalence of Cigarette Smoking and Smokeless Tobacco Use*. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.healthysarkansas.com/grants/county-specific-prevalence-cigarette-smoking-smokeless-tobacco-use-arkansas.org>. CDC. (2005). *Healthy Youth! Youth Online: Comprehensive Results of Alcohol and Other Drug Use*. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/yrbss/SelQuestyear.asp?cat=3&desc=Alcohol%20%20Other%20Drug%20Use&loc=AR.org>.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>2. Provide staff training in "Love and Logic" and "PBSS" to help students achieve opportunity, freedom, and respect using educational interventions that motivate and create positive change. Staff will use training to reach at-risk individuals, instill hope to overcome poverty, build positive classroom discipline built on student self-discipline, create a greater understanding of severely disturbed students, reduce violence, create bully-free classrooms, and reduce drug abuse. Site visits to other model programs in violence prevention and character education will be made available to staff. Surveys will be utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Professional Development                      Action Type: Program Evaluation                      Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Keith Watson, David Stepp, Sandra Hollaway, Debra Heath, Principals</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>3. To provide teachers and support staff professional development through professional text, conferences and workshops such as Arkansas Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, AR NCA Arkansas State Counselors Conference, "Dealing with Child Abuse"; Character Counts Conference; Love and Logic, Why Try, Positive Action, and other character, physical health, tobacco, safety, and drug education conferences in and out of state. Materials and supplies will be purchased in building plans to support professional development and enhance the educational programs.</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development                      Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Keith Watson, Debra Heath, David Stepp, and Sandra Hollaway, Principals</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 12/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>1. The Watch D.O.G.S. Program will be implemented in grades K-5. A survey will be conducted with participants in the K-5 Watch D.O.G.S. Program at the end of each day of service.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Parental Engagement                      Action Type: Program Evaluation                      Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Debra Heath, Principal; Sandra Hollaway, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 08/23/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>4. Classroom teachers, counselors, Sheriff's Department, and other staff will provide lessons aligned with "Positive Action", "Why Try", "PBSS", DARE, STOP N-THINK, Smart-Choices Better Changes, and other related programs designed to build the foundation for the development of a healthy, nonviolent, safe and drug-free lifestyle for all students. Instruction regarding student health and safety, drug abuse, violence, bullying, positive behavior, and character traits will be provided under the direction of school counselors. Parents will be included in activities throughout the year to heighten awareness and knowledge of interventions to prevent youth violence, drug use, and to build positive character traits.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Brenda Martin, Pam Gaskin, Laura Fowler, Charles Wimbush, Counselors</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>5. Provide professional development in school bus safety to staff and students to reduce violence and drug use. Purchase with district funds drug free and safety materials to monitor student behavior in an effort to reduce violence on buses to create a safe environment.</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development                      Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Jerry Lee, Transportation Director</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$0</p>

Intervention: The district will provide a health/nutrition program aligned with the Arkansas Physical and Health Education frameworks and will be monitored by district staff.

Scientific Based Research: Smith, J. (2003). Education and Public Health: Natural Partners in Learning for Life. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Marx, E., & Northrop, D. (2000). Partnerships to Keep Students Healthy. Educational Leadership, 57(6), 22-24. PTA. (2003). Healthy Lifestyles; Childhood Obesity. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from [http://www.pta.org/pr\\_magazine\\_article\\_details\\_1127341287093.html](http://www.pta.org/pr_magazine_article_details_1127341287093.html) PTA. (2003). Healthy Lifestyles – Fact Sheet: The Need for Physical Education and Physical Activity Activity in Our Schools. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from [http://www.pta.org/pr\\_magazine\\_article\\_details\\_1127492990421.html](http://www.pta.org/pr_magazine_article_details_1127492990421.html)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
1. A district health committee will annually assess student health status using BMI data, hearing and vision screenings, and immunization records. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Wellness	Carl Easley, Interm. Supt.	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. The school will implement new guidelines set by ADE and Department of Health on nutrition requirements on school lunches, fund raisers, and classroom rewards. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Polly Poindexter, Food Director	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. The district will utilize the Cross County Extension Office to work collaboratively with staff to provide lessons on nutrition and health life styles. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Carl Easley, Interm Supt.	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. To meet the requirements of ACT 1220 the district will provide programs and training for staff and students on physical activity, fitness, healthy eating tips, and weight management. Student, parent, and community awareness will be promoted through building level programs. The district health community will review and update plans annually. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Carl Easley, Interm Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
6. Wynne Primary students will be provided with fresh fruits and vegetable snacks two days per week to increase an exposure and interest to exocitic and healthy food choices. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Polly Poindexter, Food Services Director	Start: 09/14/2011 End: 05/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. Wynne Intermediate School will participate in a Mid-South Kids Marathon to promote healthy life styles in children. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 08/23/2011 End: 05/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$0</b>

Priority 4: An educational program for health, physical education, and nutrition that is aligned with the Arkansas Physical Education and Health Curriculum Frameworks will be provided for all students and staff.

1. Wynne School District 2009 BMI Body Mass Index - Spring 2009 Male/Female by School District Overall: Classifications: 1171 Students Calculated: 655 Males: 1.8% Underweight, 57.7% Healthy, 16.6% Overweight, 23.8% Obese; 616 Females: 1.9% Underweight, 56.8% Healthy, 17% Overweight, 24.2% Obese. NO Significant difference between male and female average At-risk status 42% and Healthy status 58%. Body Mass Index - Spring 2009, 2008, 2007 BMI Classification by School District Overall, County Overall, and Statewide Overall: At-Risk for/or Overweight 2009 41.99%, 2007 41.69%, 2008 42.57%, 2007 42.76%; Cross (County) Overall: At-Risk for/or Overweight 2009 42.19, 2008 42.72%; State Overall: At-Risk for/or Overweight 2009 37.9%, 2008 37.8%, 2007 37.5%.
2. Self-Assessment/Planning Guide School Health Index indicators to identify strengths and weakness for Wynne Schools in 2008-2009, 2007-2008, 2006-2007, 2005-2006, & 2004-2005 scores on five of the eight modules: Primary: 2008-2009 School Health Policies & Environment 78%; Health Ed 71%; Physical Ed & Other Physical Activity Programs 95%; Nutrition Sevices 94%; Family & Community Involvement 50%. 2007-2008 School Health Policies & Environment 92%; Health Education 48%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 95%; Nutrition Services 76%; and Family & Community Involvement 66%; 2006-2007 School Health Policies & Environment 66%; Health Education 33%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 82%; Nutrition Services 59%; and Family & Community Involvement 61%; 2005-2006 School Health Policies &

Supporting Data:

Environment 93%; Health Education 64%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 89%; Nutrition Services 78%; and Family & Community Involvement 61%; Primary: 2004-2005 School Health Policies & Environment 66%; Health Education 33% Physical Education & Other Physical Activity 82% Nutrition Services 59%; and Family and Community Involvement 61%. Intermediate: 2008-2009 School Health Policies & Environment 89%; Health Education 90%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 87%; Nutrition Services 88%; and Family & Community Involvement 94%; 2007-2008 School Health Policies & Environment 89%; Health Education 80%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 94%; Nutrition Services 76%; and Family & Community Involvement 66%; 2006-2007 School Health Policies & Environment 83%; Health Education 54%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 92%; Nutrition Services 81%; and Family & Community Involvement 61%; 2005-2006 School Health Policies & Environment 92%; Health Education 50%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 87%; Nutrition Services 81%; and Family & Community Involvement 78%; 2004-2005 School Health Policies & Environment 86%; Health Education 38% Physical Education & Other Physical Activity 85% Nutrition Services 73%; and Family and Community Involvement 39%. Junior High: 2008-2009 School Health Policies & Environment 66%; Health Education 70%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 95%; Nutrition Services 52.3%; and Family & Community Involvement 56%; 2007-2008 School Health Policies & Environment 91%; Health Education 81%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 84%; Nutrition Services 78%; and Family & Community Involvement 66%; 2006-2007 School Health Policies & Environment 90%; Health Education 81%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 87%; Nutrition Services 90%; and School Health Services 86%; 2005-2006 School Health Policies & Environment 90%; Health Education 96%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 91%; Nutrition Services 83%; and Family & Community Involvement 67%; Junior High: 2004-2005 School Health Policies & Environment 81%; Health Education 100% Physical Education & Other Physical Activity 89% Nutrition Services 35%; and Family and Community Involvement 44% High School: 2008-2009 School Health Policies & Environment 88%; Health Ed. 96%; Physical Ed. 91%; Nutrition Services 48%; and Family & Community Involvement 72%. 2007-2008 School Health Policies & Environment 91%; Health Education 97%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 82%; Nutrition Services 83%; and Family & Community Involvement 55%; 2006-2007 School Health Policies & Environment 73%; Health Education 77%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 77%; Nutrition Services 45%; and School Health Service 19%; High School: 2005-2006 School Health Policies & Environment 83%; Health Education 94%; Physical Education & Other Physical Activity Programs 89%; Nutrition Services 78%; and Family & Community Involvement 61%; High School: 2004-2005 School Health Policies & Environment 69%; Health Education 95% Physical Education & Other Physical Activity 70% Nutrition Services 47%; and Family and Community Involvement 16%

3. A review of data from the most current three years collected from the National Center for Disease Control (CDC) Health Youth: Percentage of students who drank three or more glasses per day of milk during the past seven days - 2005 9.8%, 2001 14.6%, 1999 15.6%; Percentage of students who ate vegetables one or more times during the past seven days - 2005 77.4%, 2001 84%, 1999 82.8%; Percentage of students who ate green salad one or more times during the past seven days - 2005 56.1%, 2001 63.3%, 1999 61%; Percentage of students who ate fruit one or more times during the past seven days - 2005 75.7%, 2001 77.9%, 1999 79.6%.
4. Teenage pregnancies Wynne High School in 2010-11 8; 2008-2009 14 and Wynne Junior High 0; In 2006-2007 School pregnancies High School 26 and Junior High 03. The teenage pregnancies at Wynne High & Wynne Junior School decreased from 2007 to 2011 by 18 pregnancies over a two year timeline.
5. Bullying Survey - 2010-2011 Student and parent surveys indicate the need for an Anti-bullying Action. 50% of parents agree and 38% of students indicate they have been bullied. Safe In-Classroom 85% while on school grounds 80% fell safe (2010-2011).

**Goal** The Wynne School District will provide support and assistance to promote appropriate nutrition education as part of the health education program as aligned with the Arkansas Physical Education and Health Education Frameworks.

**Benchmark** There will be an annual increase in instructional programs focusing on fostering healthy eating and life lifestyles and an increase in physical activities for all students throughout the district.

Intervention: Increase wellness awareness and strengthen existing health and physical education programs.				
Scientific Based Research: Bluestein, Jane (2001). Creating Emotionally Safe Schools A guide fo Educators and Parents. Health Communications Inc. Roberts, Walter B. (2008) Working With Parents Of Bullies and Victims. Corwin Press. Smith, J. (2003). Education and Public Health: Natural Partners in Learning for Life. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. PTA. (2003). Healthy Lifestyles; Childhood Obesity. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <a href="http://www.pta.org/pr_magazine_article_details_1127341287093.html">http://www.pta.org/pr_magazine_article_details_1127341287093.html</a> PTA. (2003). Healthy Lifestyles – Fact Sheet: The Need for Physical Education and Physical Activity in Our Schools. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <a href="http://www.pta.org/pr_magazine_article_details_1127492990421.html">http://www.pta.org/pr_magazine_article_details_1127492990421.html</a> CDC. (2005). Healthy Youth! Youth Online: Secondary School Health Education Related to Nutrition and Physical Activity: Selected Sites, United States, 2004. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5530a2.htm">http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5530a2.htm</a> Secondary School Health Education Related to Nutrition and Physical Activity—Selected Sites, United States, 2004. Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report 2005;55(30):821–824. Competitive Foods and Beverages Available for Purchase in Secondary Schools—Selected Sites, United States, 2004. Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report 2005;54(37):917–921. Dwyer, K., Jackson, S., & Osher, D. (2004). Safe, Supportive, and Successful Schools: Step by Step. Longmont, CO: Sopris West. Jackson, C. (2007, Spring). Fat...So? Size acceptance for All students. Teaching Tolerance, 39-43. Arkansas Department of Health and Human Services Division of Health. (2005). Arkansas County-Specific Prevalence of Cigarette Smoking and Smokeless Tobacco Use. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <a href="http://www.healtharkansas.com/grants/county-specific-prevalence-cigarette-smoking-smokeless-tobacco-use-arkansas.org">http://www.healtharkansas.com/grants/county-specific-prevalence-cigarette-smoking-smokeless-tobacco-use-arkansas.org</a> . CDC. (2005). Healthy Youth! Youth Online: Comprehensive Results of Alcohol and Other Drug Use. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from <a href="http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/yrbss/SelQuestyear.asp?cat=3&amp;desc=Alcohol%20%20Other%20Drug%20Use&amp;loc=AR.org">http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/yrbss/SelQuestyear.asp?cat=3&amp;desc=Alcohol%20%20Other%20Drug%20Use&amp;loc=AR.org</a> .				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
3. The district will work with outside agencies: Cross Ridge Hospital, Cross County Department of Health, Cross County Extension Office, and local health facilities to provide programs	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> </ul>	ACTION \$

and training for staff and students. Action Type: Collaboration		06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	BUDGET:
2. The district health committee will conduct an annual assessment of district health status using the SHI, BMI, Economic Indicators, and the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to make recommendations for improvement. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. The district will implement guidelines set by ADE and Department of Health on nutrition requirements for school lunches, fund raisers, and classroom rewards. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
9. Professional Development will be provided for all staff on ACT 1220, and all will be made aware of and encouraged to participate in local wellness programs. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. A district health committee, consisting of selected faculty members, students, parents, and community members, was formed to assist in the implementation of the nutrition and physical activity standards developed by ADE and the State Board of Health. Assessments of each school campus will be conducted utilizing the School Health Index. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. BMI measurements will be obtained in accordance with state regulations. Parents will be provided with results of the BMI screening. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Kathy Lee, Assistant Superintendent, Lorena Orman, Nurse	Start: 08/21/2011 End: 04/28/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
7. Wynne Intermediate School will participate in a Mid-South Kids Marathon to support efforts in constructing a walking track around the school. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 08/23/2011 End: 05/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
8. Planning for a Community Action on Walking School Bus Grant and Safe Routes to School in collaboration with community, school, and PTA. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
10. Wynne School District is working in collaboration with the community to host a County Wide Health Fair. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator; Kathy Lee, Assistant Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 5: District Administration will support and direct the efforts to align the Wynne Junior High with the Scholastic Audit findings.

- 2007 Scholastic Audit Summary: Standard - 1 - Academic Performance - Curriculum Curriculum 1.1a Curriculum is aligned with Arkansas Academic Content Standards and Student Learning Expectations. 1.1b District initiates,

facilitates discussions among schools regarding curriculum standards 1.1c District initiates, facilitates discussions to eliminate unnecessary overlaps 1.1d Evidence of vertical communication, intentional focus on key curriculum transition points 1.1e School curriculum provides specific links to continuing education 1.1f Systematic process for monitoring, evaluating and reviewing curriculum 1.1g Curriculum provides access to an academic core In Standard 1: Academic Performance - Curriculum 71% of the 7 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (1.1a, 1.1b, 1.1e, 1.1f and 1.1g). While 29% of the 7 Indicators were in level 1 little or no development and implementation (1.1c and 1.1d). Standard - 2 - Academic Performance - Classroom Evaluation/Assessment Classroom Evaluation/Assessment 2.1a Classroom assessments frequent, rigorous, aligned with Arkansas' Academic Core Content Standards 2.1b Teachers collaborate in the design of authentic assessment 2.1c Students can articulate what is required to be proficient 2.1d Test scores are used to identify curriculum gaps 2.1e Assessments designed to provide feedback on student learning for instructional purposes 2.1f Performance standards communicated, evident in classrooms, observable in student work 2.1g ACTAAP coordinated by school and district leadership 2.1h Samples of student work are analyzed In Standard 2: Academic Performance - Classroom Evaluation/Assessment 87% of the 8 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (2.1a, 2.1c, 2.1d, 2.1e, 2.1f, 2.1g and 2.1h). While 13% of the 8 Indicators were in level 1 little or no development and implementation (2.1b). Standard - 3 - Academic Performance - Instruction Instruction 3.1a Evidence that effective and varied instructional strategies are used in all classrooms 3.1b Instructional strategies and learning activities are aligned 3.1c Instructional strategies/activities are consistently monitored...diverse student population 3.1d Teachers demonstrate content knowledge 3.1e Evidence that teachers incorporate the use of technology 3.1f Instructional resources are sufficient to deliver the curriculum 3.1g Teachers examine and discuss student work 3.1h Homework is frequent and monitored, tied to instructional practice In Standard 3: Academic Performance - Instruction 100% of the 8 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (3.1a, 3.1b, 3.1c, 3.1d, 3.1e, 3.1f, 3.1g and 3.1h). Standard - 4 - Learning Environment - School Culture School Culture 4.1a Leadership support for a safe, orderly and equitable learning environment 4.1b Leadership creates experiences that all children can learn 4.1c Teachers hold high expectations for all students 4.1d Teachers, staff involved in decision-making processes regarding teaching and learning 4.1e Teachers accept their role in student success 4.1f School assigns staff...opportunities for all students 4.1g Teachers communicate regularly with families 4.1h Evidence that the teachers and staff care 4.1i Multiple communication strategies...to all stakeholders 4.1j Evidence that student achievement is highly valued In Standard 4: Learning Environment - School Culture 9% of the 11 Indicators were in level 3 fully functional and operational level of development and implementation (4.1a), 73% of the 11 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (4.1b, 4.1c, 4.1d, 4.1g, 4.1h, 4.1i and 4.1j), and 18% of the 11 Indicators were in level 1 little or no development and implementation (4.1e and 4.1f). Standard - 5 - Learning Environment - Student, Family and Community Support Student, Family and Community Support 5.1a Families and the community are active partners 5.1b All students have access to all the curriculum 5.1c Reduce barriers to learning 5.1d Students are provided opportunities to receive additional assistance 5.1e School maintains an accurate student record system In Standard 5: Learning Environment - Student, Family and Community Support 20% of the 5 Indicators were in level 3 fully functional and operational level of development (5.1e) and implementation and 80% of the 5 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (5.1a, 5.1b, 5.1c and 5.1d). Standard - 6 - Learning Environment - Professional Growth, Development, and Evaluation Professional Development 6.1a Support for the long-term professional growth of the individual staff members 6.1b The school has an intentional plan for building instructional capacity 6.1c Staff development priorities..alignment..goals for student performance 6.1d Plans for school improvement directly connect goals for student learning 6.1e Professional development is on-going and job-embedded 6.1f Professional development planning connect student achievement data Professional Growth and Evaluation 6.2a Clearly defined evaluation process 6.2b Leadership provides the fiscal resources for the appropriate professional growth 6.2c Employee evaluation and the individual professional growth plan to improve staff proficiency 6.2d A process of personnel evaluation which meets or exceeds standards set in statute 6.2e The school/district improvement plan identifies specific instructional needs 6.2f Evaluation process to provide teachers..change behavior and instructional practice In Standard 6: Learning Environment - Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation 67% of the 12 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (6.1a, 6.1c, 6.1e, 6.1f, 6.2a, 6.2b, 6.2d and 6.2e) and 33% of the 12 Indicators were in level 1 little or no development and implementation (6.1b, 6.1d, 6.2c and 6.2f). Standard - 7 - Efficiency - Leadership Leadership 7.1a Leadership has developed and sustained a shared vision 7.1b Leadership decisions focused on student academic data 7.1c All administrators have a growth plan 7.1d Evidence that the leadership team disaggregates data 7.1e Leadership ensures all instructional staff...access to curriculum related materials 7.1f Leadership ensures that time is protected...instructional issues 7.1g Leadership plans and allocates resources 7.1h School/district leadership provides policy and resource infrastructure 7.1i Process for the development and the implementation of the local school board of education policy 7.1j Local school board of education/school have intentional focus on student academic performance 7.1k Principal demonstrates leadership skills in the areas of academic performance, learning environment and efficiency. In Standard 7: Efficiency - Leadership 9% of the 11 Indicators were in level 3 fully functional and operational level of development and implementation (7.1h), 73% of the 11 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation 97.1a, 7.1b, 7.1d, 7.1e, 7.1f, 7.1g, 7.1i and 7.1j), and 18% of the 11 Indicators were in level 1 little or no development and implementation (7.1c and 7.1k). Standard - 8 - Efficiency - School Organization and Fiscal Resources Organization of the School 8.1a School is organized...use of all available resources 8.1b All students have access to all the curriculum 8.1c Staff are allocated based upon the learning needs of all students 8.1d Staff makes efficient use of instructional time 8.1e Staff...planning vertically and horizontally across content areas 8.1f Schedule aligned with the school's mission Resource Allocation and Integration 8.2a Clearly defined process provides equitable and consistent use of fiscal resources 8.2b Budget reflects decisions directed by an assessment of need 8.2c District and local school board of education analyze funding and other resource requests 8.2d Resources are allocated and integrated to address student needs In

Standard 8: Efficiency - School Organization and Fiscal Resources 30% of the 10 Indicators were in level 3 fully functional and operational level of development and implementation (8.2a, 8.2c and 8.2d) and 70% of the 10 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (8.1a, 8.1b, 8.1c, 8.1d, 8.1e, 8.1f and 8.2b). Standard - 9 - Efficiency - Comprehensive and Effective Planning Defining the School Vision, Mission, Beliefs 9.1a Collaborative process used to develop the vision, beliefs, mission Development of the Profile 9.2a Planning process involves collecting, managing and analyzing data 9.2b Use data for school improvement planning Defining Desired Results for Student Learning 9.3a School and district plans reflect learning research, expectations for student learning 9.3b Analyze their students' unique learning needs 9.3c Results for student learning are defined Analyzing Instructional and Organizational Effectiveness 9.4a Strengths and limitations are identified 9.4b Goals for building, strengthening capacity Development of the Improvement Plan 9.5a Steps for school improvement aligned with improvement goals 9.5b ACSIP identifies resources, timelines 9.5c Evaluating the effectiveness of the ACSIP 9.5d ACSIP is aligned with the school's profile, beliefs, mission, desired results Implementation and Documentation 9.6a ACSIP is implemented as developed 9.6b School evaluates the degree to which it achieves the goals and objectives for student learning 9.6c The school evaluates the degree to which it achieves the expected impact 9.6d Evidence of attempts to sustain the commitment to continuous improvement In Standard 9: Efficiency - Comprehensive and Effective Planning 94% of the 16 Indicators were in level 2 of the performance levels which indicates limited development or partial implementation (9.1a, 9.2a, 9.2b, 9.3a, 9.3b, 9.3c, 9.4b, 9.5a, 9.5b, 9.5c, 9.5d, 9.6a, 9.6b, 9.6c and 9.6d) and 6% of the 16 Indicators were in level 1 little or no development and implementation (9.4a).

2. Student needs: 1-A. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 56.4% of Combined Students 70 Students: 40.0% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 136 Students: 64.7% of Caucasian Students 119 Students: 42.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 56.5% of Combined Students 72 Students: 33.3% of African American Students 5 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 173 Students: 64.1% of Caucasian Students 143 Students: 39.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 32 Students: 15.6% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 50.6% of Combined Students 79 Students: 38.0% of African American Students 5 Students: 60.0% of Hispanic Students 167 Students: 55.7% of Caucasian Students 140 Students: 37.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 9.7% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 students: 67.9% of Combined Students 58 students: 51.7% of African/American Students 2 students: 100% of Hispanic Students 160 students: 71.9% of Caucasian Students 122 students: 55.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 students: N/A of LEP Students 24 students: 8.3% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 45.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 37.4%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 49.0% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 38.6%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response in Literary Passage 18.6% and Practical Passage 28.8%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 35.4%, Content Passage 32.4%, Practical Passage 38.4%, and Writing 40.0%. 1-B. Benchmark-7th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 197 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 72 Students: 30.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 50.0% of Hispanic Students 123 Students: 69.1% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 37.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 16 Students: 12.5% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 230 Students: 56.0% of Combined Students 83 Students: 32.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 144 Students: 68.7% of Caucasian Students 133 Students: 43.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 35 Students: 14.2% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 252 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 77 Students: 27.3% of African American Students 4 Students: 25.0% of Hispanic Students 169 Students: 67.1% of Caucasian Students 32 Students: 9.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 143 Students: 41.3% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 60.9% of Combined Students 80 Students: 37.5% of African/American Students 5 Students: 80% of Hispanic Students 114 Students: 71.7% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 48.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 7.0% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Practical Passage 47.8% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 35.0%, Content Passage 33.0%, and Practical Passage 36.6%; Multiple Choice Writing 43.2%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 54.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 42.0 and Content Passage 41.2%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: All Strands: Open Response in Literary Passage 29.4%, Content Passage 23.8% and Practical Passage 36.2%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 38.4%, Content Passage 35.8%, Practical Passage 39.2%, and Writing Multiple Choice 29.4%. 1-C. Benchmark-8th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 Students: 61.9% of Combined Students 57 Students: 36.8% of African American Students 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students 160 Students: 70.6% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 44.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 4.1% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 210 Students: 70.0% of Combined Students 76 Students: 51.3% of African American Students 3 Students: 66.6% of Hispanic Students 131 Students: 80.9% of Caucasian Students 121 Students: 55.3% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 23 Students: 13.0% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 236 Students: 59.7% of Combined Students 80 Students: 41.3% of

Supporting  
Data:

African American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 153 Students: 68.6% of Caucasian Students 137 Students: 47.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 37 Students: 16.2% of Students with Disabilities 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 45.2% of African/American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 172 Students: 81.4% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 56.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 10.7% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 38.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 44.0% (not a full % pt. above AYP) and Content Passage 31.6%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Content Passage 41.4%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Content Passage 33.4%; Multiple Choice Writing 44.6% (only 1.3% above AYP). The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response Content 21.8% and Practical Passage 30.4%; Multiple Choice Literary Passage 31.6%; Writing 32.2%. Student needs: 1-A. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 56.4% of Combined Students 70 Students: 40.0% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 136 Students: 64.7% of Caucasian Students 119 Students: 42.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 56.5% of Combined Students 72 Students: 33.3% of African American Students 5 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 173 Students: 64.1% of Caucasian Students 143 Students: 39.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 32 Students: 15.6% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 50.6% of Combined Students 79 Students: 38.0% of African American Students 5 Students: 60.0% of Hispanic Students 167 Students: 55.7% of Caucasian Students 140 Students: 37.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 9.7% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 students: 67.9% of Combined Students 58 students: 51.7% of African/American Students 2 students: 100% of Hispanic Students 160 students: 71.9% of Caucasian Students 122 students: 55.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 students: N/A of LEP Students 24 students: 8.3% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 45.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 37.4%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 49.0% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 38.6%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response in Literary Passage 18.6% and Practical Passage 28.8%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 35.4%, Content Passage 32.4%, Practical Passage 38.4%, and Writing 40.0%. 1-B. Benchmark-7th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 197 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 72 Students: 30.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 50.0% of Hispanic Students 123 Students: 69.1% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 37.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 16 Students: 12.5% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 230 Students: 56.0% of Combined Students 83 Students: 32.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 144 Students: 68.7% of Caucasian Students 133 Students: 43.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 35 Students: 14.2% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 252 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 77 Students: 27.3% of African American Students 4 Students: 25.0% of Hispanic Students 169 Students: 67.1% of Caucasian Students 32 Students: 9.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 143 Students: 41.3% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 60.9% of Combined Students 80 Students: 37.5% of African/American Students 5 Students: 80% of Hispanic Students 114 Students: 71.7% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 48.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 7.0% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Practical Passage 47.8% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 35.0%, Content Passage 33.0%, and Practical Passage 36.6%; Multiple Choice Writing 43.2%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 54.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 42.0 and Content Passage 41.2%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: All Strands: Open Response in Literary Passage 29.4%, Content Passage 23.8% and Practical Passage 36.2%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 38.4%, Content Passage 35.8%, Practical Passage 39.2%, and Writing Multiple Choice 29.4%. 1-C. Benchmark-8th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 Students: 61.9% of Combined Students 57 Students: 36.8% of African American Students 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students 160 Students: 70.6% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 44.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 4.1% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 210 Students: 70.0% of Combined Students 76 Students: 51.3% of African American Students 3 Students: 66.6% of Hispanic Students 131 Students: 80.9% of Caucasian Students 121 Students: 55.3% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 23 Students: 13.0% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 236 Students: 59.7% of Combined Students 80 Students: 41.3% of African American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 153 Students: 68.6% of Caucasian Students 137 Students: 47.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 37 Students: 16.2% of Students with Disabilities 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 45.2% of African/American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 172 Students: 81.4% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 56.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 10.7% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 38.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African

Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 44.0% (not a full % pt. above AYP) and Content Passage 31.6%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Content Passage 41.4%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Content Passage 33.4%; Multiple Choice Writing 44.6% (only 1.3% above AYP). The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response Content 21.8% and Practical Passage 30.4%; Multiple Choice Literary Passage 31.6%; Writing 32.2%. Student needs: 1-A. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 56.4% of Combined Students 70 Students: 40.0% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 136 Students: 64.7% of Caucasian Students 119 Students: 42.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 56.5% of Combined Students 72 Students: 33.3% of African American Students 5 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 173 Students: 64.1% of Caucasian Students 143 Students: 39.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 32 Students: 15.6% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 50.6% of Combined Students 79 Students: 38.0% of African American Students 5 Students: 60.0% of Hispanic Students 167 Students: 55.7% of Caucasian Students 140 Students: 37.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 9.7% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 students: 67.9% of Combined Students 58 students: 51.7% of African/American Students 2 students: 100% of Hispanic Students 160 students: 71.9% of Caucasian Students 122 students: 55.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 students: N/A of LEP Students 24 students: 8.3% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 45.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 37.4%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 49.0% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 38.6%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response in Literary Passage 18.6% and Practical Passage 28.8%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 35.4%, Content Passage 32.4%, Practical Passage 38.4%, and Writing 40.0%. 1-B. Benchmark-7th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 197 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 72 Students: 30.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 50.0% of Hispanic Students 123 Students: 69.1% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 37.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 16 Students: 12.5% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 230 Students: 56.0% of Combined Students 83 Students: 32.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 144 Students: 68.7% of Caucasian Students 133 Students: 43.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 35 Students: 14.2% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 252 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 77 Students: 27.3% of African American Students 4 Students: 25.0% of Hispanic Students 169 Students: 67.1% of Caucasian Students 32 Students: 9.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 143 Students: 41.3% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 60.9% of Combined Students 80 Students: 37.5% of African/American Students 5 Students: 80% of Hispanic Students 114 Students: 71.7% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 48.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 7.0% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Practical Passage 47.8% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 35.0%, Content Passage 33.0%, and Practical Passage 36.6%; Multiple Choice Writing 43.2%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 54.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 42.0 and Content Passage 41.2%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: All Strands: Open Response in Literary Passage 29.4%, Content Passage 23.8% and Practical Passage 36.2%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 38.4%, Content Passage 35.8%, Practical Passage 39.2%, and Writing Multiple Choice 29.4%. 1-C. Benchmark-8th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 Students: 61.9% of Combined Students 57 Students: 36.8% of African American Students 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students 160 Students: 70.6% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 44.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 4.1% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 210 Students: 70.0% of Combined Students 76 Students: 51.3% of African American Students 3 Students: 66.6% of Hispanic Students 131 Students: 80.9% of Caucasian Students 121 Students: 55.3% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 23 Students: 13.0% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 236 Students: 59.7% of Combined Students 80 Students: 41.3% of African American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 153 Students: 68.6% of Caucasian Students 137 Students: 47.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 37 Students: 16.2% of Students with Disabilities 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 45.2% of African/American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 172 Students: 81.4% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 56.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 10.7% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 38.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 44.0% (not a full % pt. above AYP) and Content Passage 31.6%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Content Passage 41.4%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Content Passage 33.4%; Multiple Choice Writing 44.6% (only 1.3% above AYP). The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response Content 21.8% and Practical Passage 30.4%; Multiple Choice Literary Passage 31.6%; Writing 32.2%. Student needs: 1-A. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring

- Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 56.4% of Combined Students 70 Students: 40.0% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 136 Students: 64.7% of Caucasian Students 119 Students: 42.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 56.5% of Combined Students 72 Students: 33.3% of African American Students 5 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 173 Students: 64.1% of Caucasian Students 143 Students: 39.8% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 32 Students: 15.6% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 253 Students: 50.6% of Combined Students 79 Students: 38.0% of African American Students 5 Students: 60.0% of Hispanic Students 167 Students: 55.7% of Caucasian Students 140 Students: 37.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 9.7% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 students: 67.9% of Combined Students 58 students: 51.7% of African/American Students 2 students: 100% of Hispanic Students 160 students: 71.9% of Caucasian Students 122 students: 55.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 students: N/A of LEP Students 24 students: 8.3% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 45.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 37.4%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 49.0% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 38.6%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response in Literary Passage 18.6% and Practical Passage 28.8%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 35.4%, Content Passage 32.4%, Practical Passage 38.4%, and Writing 40.0%. 1-B. Benchmark-7th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 197 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 72 Students: 30.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 50.0% of Hispanic Students 123 Students: 69.1% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 37.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 16 Students: 12.5% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 230 Students: 56.0% of Combined Students 83 Students: 32.5% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 144 Students: 68.7% of Caucasian Students 133 Students: 43.6% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 35 Students: 14.2% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 252 Students: 54.8% of Combined Students 77 Students: 27.3% of African American Students 4 Students: 25.0% of Hispanic Students 169 Students: 67.1% of Caucasian Students 32 Students: 9.4% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 143 Students: 41.3% of Students with Disabilities 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 60.9% of Combined Students 80 Students: 37.5% of African/American Students 5 Students: 80% of Hispanic Students 114 Students: 71.7% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 48.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 7.0% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Practical Passage 47.8% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 35.0%, Content Passage 33.0%, and Practical Passage 36.6%; Multiple Choice Writing 43.2%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Literary Passage 54.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Literary Passage 42.0 and Content Passage 41.2%. The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: All Strands: Open Response in Literary Passage 29.4%, Content Passage 23.8% and Practical Passage 36.2%; Multiple Choice in Literary Passage 38.4%, Content Passage 35.8%, Practical Passage 39.2%, and Writing Multiple Choice 29.4%. 1-C. Benchmark-8th Grade Literacy Exam 2005-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 Students: 61.9% of Combined Students 57 Students: 36.8% of African American Students 0 Students: N/A% of Hispanic Students 160 Students: 70.6% of Caucasian Students 113 Students: 44.2% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 24 Students: 4.1% of Students with Disabilities 2006-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 210 Students: 70.0% of Combined Students 76 Students: 51.3% of African American Students 3 Students: 66.6% of Hispanic Students 131 Students: 80.9% of Caucasian Students 121 Students: 55.3% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 23 Students: 13.0% of Students with Disabilities 2007-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 236 Students: 59.7% of Combined Students 80 Students: 41.3% of African American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 153 Students: 68.6% of Caucasian Students 137 Students: 47.5% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 37 Students: 16.2% of Students with Disabilities 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 45.2% of African/American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 172 Students: 81.4% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 56.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 10.7% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Open Response in Content Passage 38.2% which exceeds AYP of 43.3%. The lowest identified areas for African Americans were: Open Response in Literary Passage 44.0% (not a full % pt. above AYP) and Content Passage 31.6%. The lowest identified areas for Hispanic were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Caucasian were: Open Response in Content Passage 41.4%. The lowest identified areas for Econ. Disadvantaged students were: Open Response Content Passage 33.4%; Multiple Choice Writing 44.6% (only 1.3% above AYP). The lowest identified areas for LEP students were: N/A The lowest identified areas for Students with Disabilities were: Open Response Content 21.8% and Practical Passage 30.4%; Multiple Choice Literary Passage 31.6%; Writing 32.2%.
3. CRESC Professional Development Needs Survey Report for Wynne Junior High School. (April, 2008) Based on your latest School Improvement Plan and Benchmark/ITBS data, select a maximum of three (s) areas which best identify your professional development needs. Total Staff Responding: 56 Top three response values: Instructional Strategies (35), Assessment (26), Educational Technology (23).
  4. 2008 Percent Proficient for Status and Growth by Subgroup (AMO) 6-8 Literacy Percent Proficient Status 1. Combined Population 67 2. African American 45.3 3. Caucasian 75.3 4. Economically Disadvantaged 53.8 5. Students with Disabilities 15.5 Literacy Percent Proficient Growth 1. Combined Population 69.4 2. African American 49.3 3. Caucasian 77.1 4. Economically Disadvantaged 57.7 5. Students with disabilities 16.7

5. 2008 Percent Proficient for Status and Growth by Subgroup (AMO) 6-8 Mathematics Percent Proficient Status 1. Combined Population 76.4 2. African American 56.2 3. Caucasian 84.3 4. Economically Disadvantaged 64 5. Students with Disabilities 28.6 Mathematics Percent Proficient Growth 1. Combined Population 80.3 2. African American 63.2 3. Caucasian 87 4. Economically Disadvantaged 70.2 5. Students with disabilities 36.9
6. 2008 School Gain Index Wynne Intermediate School Student Growth Grade 6 to Grade 7 and Grade 7 to Grade 8 1. School Gain Index Value 0.21 2. School Performance Gain Rating 4-exceeding improvement standards 3. Total School Enrollment 736 4. Number of Students Calculations from Matched Data Set 666

Goal Build effective leaders to create a supportive learning culture at the Wynne Junior High.

Benchmark Evidence of leadership skills shown through the attendance and successful completion of well planned professional development addressing team building skills, listening skills, site-based management, instructional and organizational leadership as in the Scholastic Audit deficit areas to be completed from August 2011 to June 2012.

Intervention: School leaders will practice research based leadership skills to build capacity in all staff members and create a supportive learning culture in 2011-2012 school year as stated in Wynne Junior High School actions. Leadership skills are evaluated by periodical building principal evaluations and classroom Walk-Throughs.				
Scientific Based Research: Marzano, R. J. (2003). What Works In Schools: Translating Research Into Action. Alexandria, VA ASCD. Fullan, Michael. (2004). Leading In A Culture Of Change. Wiley & Sons, San Francisco, CA. Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Breaux, A., Whitaker, T. (2006). Seven Simple Secrets: What the Best Teachers Know and Do. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
2. School leaders (principal, assistant principal, assistant superintendent, superintendent and instructional coaches) will be provided site based professional development through JBHM, CRESC, ADE, and other educational consultant groups. State and National Conferences made available to select staff as deemed appropriate during 2010-2012 focusing on the development of team building skills, listening skills, site based management, instructional and organizational leadership, as evidenced by staff development records and presentation to Joint Leadership Team. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Office</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. School leaders will maintain active membership in professional organizations which encourage development of leadership skills and competencies as evidenced by membership records such as AAEA and ASCD. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Professional Development	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. WJHS (Wynne Junior High School) has been classified as SI 7 State Directed. Administration, select staff, parents, and community leaders in 2011-2012 will continue to visit other districts that have increased student achievement through restructuring or districts that are meeting standards with a concentration in the area of African American and Students with Disabilities. JBHM programs RTI will be implemented. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. Wynne School District administrators and support staff will meet monthly in Joint Leadership Team Meetings to address effective leadership skills to strength and create a supportive learning culture. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 09/11/2010 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal Professional Development based on teacher and student needs.

Benchmark Committee based professional development provided for Wynne Junior High School Staff based on results of the CRESC Staff Development Survey and student achievement data. Staff development time, addressing these specific needs, will be increased by six hours during the 2011-2012 school year.

Intervention: Professional development based on analysis of teacher and student needs in the 2010-2011 school year will be used to plan the 2011-2012 staff development.
Scientific Based Research: Defour, R., Defour, R. & Eaker, R. (2008). Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work: New Insights for Improving Schools. Soutlion Tree. Bloomington, IN. Sullivan, C.C., & Drury D. W. (2002). Building Capacity Professional Development for New and Experienced Teachers. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association. Danielson, C. (2006). Teacher Leadership: That Strengthens Professional Practice. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Schmoker, M. (2006). Results Now: How We Can Achieve Unprecedented Improvements in Teaching and Learning. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Gregory, G. H. & Chapman, C. (2002). Differentiated

Instructional Strategies: One Size Doesn't Fit All. Corwin Press Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
2. CRESC Professional Development Surveys and TAS results will be analyzed and utilized to design a targeted professional development model for Wynne Junior High School staff as evidenced by evaluation results. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Carl Easley, Interm Superintendent	Start: 09/08/2011 End: 05/29/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Create a Joint Leadership Team to guide and build curriculum focusing on School Improvement through district collaboration. The team will use research based strategies to achieve growth and aid in the professional development of staff. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 05/29/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. Target staff professional development to address students with IEP needs in the regular classroom to increase teacher competences in differentiating instruction and meeting behavioral needs. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 08/25/2011 End: 05/29/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. District staff along with Literacy and Math leaders will assist Wynne Junior High School with data disaggregation and analysis in order that results can be used to make a well defined educational decision. The data will include WJH school report card, Adequate Yearly Progress reports, benchmark reports, item analysis reports, (TLI) The Learning Institute interim assessments, Explore, Compass data and other related data when available. Action Type: Collaboration	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent grade 6-8	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. Superintendent staff will support and monitor the training of CRSEC professional development activities to the Wynne Junior High staff. Dawn Bessee will provide professional development on strategies that support DI. Jackie Reese will train administrators and staff on back-mapping protocols for lesson design and TIA training. Peer to Peer training on CWT will be provided by Sharon Coburn. Specific data anylasis to support data walls will be utilized under the leadership of McDonald, Lee, Winslow, and Naylor. Action Type: Professional Development	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 08/13/2011 End: 05/21/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal Alignment of Curriculum Content Areas.

Benchmark Curriculum alignment evidence in data collection from The Learning Institute interim assessment scores in math, reading and writing will increase from the 2009 to 2010 reports.

Intervention: Curriculum alignment efforts will be evaluated and revised in all core content areas.				
Scientific Based Research: Crevola, C., Fullan, M. & Hill, P. (2006). Breakthrough. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwinpress & NSCD Publishers. Jacobs, H. H. (2004). Getting Results with Curriculum Mapping. Alexandria, VA. ACSD.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
1. Form committees consisting of Wynne Junior High staff across the curriculum areas to meet in pre-professional development. WJHS faculty will evaluate building curriculum and move toward alignment to AR Common Core Standards. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 08/11/2011 End: 09/22/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. Administrators and teaching staff will evaluate the effectiveness of the overall alignment of curriculum through the analysis of classroom data, TLI Interim Assessments, Compass prescriptive learning data, and classroom achievement records and make adjustments in subject areas. Action Type: ADE Scholastic Audit Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 08/11/2011 End: 05/28/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>2. District Administrative staff will support JBHM efforts in RTI to minimize the barriers to student achievement to close the achievement gap.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>3. District Administrators will initiate and facilitate discussions to eliminate curriculum overlaps through monthly Joint Leadership Team Meetings. Emphasis will be placed on vertical and horizontal alignment. Professional development will consist of book studies focusing on Leadership, Parent Involvement, Poverty, and AR Common Core.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$0</p>

Priority 6: Decrease Disproportionality

Supporting Data:

1. District data in 2010-11 showed that the African American representation in Special Education compared to African American representation in the general population had a difference of 11.58%. The 2009-2010 focus monitoring data from ADE showed that the African American representation in Special Education compared to African American students in the general population had decreased to a difference of 10.40%. However in 2008-09 ADE Focus Monitoring Data indicated Wynne School District's African American representation in Special Education exceeded the state's three year average plus on standard deviation(13.41%).
2. In September, 2005, The Arkansas State Board of Education determined that Wynne District would annex Parkin District. Administrators and staff at each campus processed student records to determine strategies and actions to appropriately scheduld students and determine levels of proficiency.
3. In 2010-11, 99 referrals/transfers 36 were African American students of which 50% were transfers, 6% Parkin residents, 33% were referrals by school personnel, and 17% parent referrals. In 2009-10 of the 97 referrals/transfers 36 were African American students of which 47% were transfers, 22% Parkin residents, 14% were referrals by school personnel, and 38% parent referrals. In 2008-09, 35 of the 103 referrals/transfers were African American with 37% being transfers, 14% Parkin residents, 9% teacher referrals, and 40% parent referrals.
4. Early Intervention (EI) data 2010-11 indicates that out of 66 African American students in grades K-5 who received early intervention services 9 were referred, evaluated and placed in special education. 2009-2010 EI data indicates out of 23 African American students in grades K-5 who received early intervention services only 5 were referred, evaluated and placed. 2008-09 EI data indicates that out of 23 African American students in grades K-5 who received early intervention services only 7 were referred, evaluated and placed in special education.

Goal Decrease the relative proportion of African American to Caucasian students receiving special services.

Benchmark The Wynne School District will reduce the relative proportion of African American students and Caucasian students in special education to within one standard deviation of the state average by the end of 2011-2012 School Year.

<p>Intervention: Early intervention specialists (K-5) will be employed to reduce the need for referral and placement of students in special education. Early intervening services will assist students identified as at-risk through academic and behavioral interventions.</p>				
<p>Scientific Based Research: Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic, and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap. Rothstein, R. (2004). Tapping Student Effort, Barkley, S.(2007).The Educator's Guide to Preventing and Solving Dicipline Problems. Boyton, C.&amp; Boynton, M. 2005. Teaching Exceptional Children. Addressing Diversity in Schools: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. Richards, H., Brown, A., Forde, T.(Jan/Feb 2007). Vol. 39 No.3.</p>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>2. Data on students targeted for early intervention services will be recorded in the special education module of early intervening services in APSCN. Analysis of final data regarding the number of students who did not ultimately need special education services will be done by the ACSIP Special Education Committee and district administrators to consider continuation or modification of future early intervention services                  Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Glenda Vance, Special Ed. Supervisor</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>4. Early intervention specialist, Nancy Dunaway .70 FTE Title VI-B and .30 FTE Local who is a National Board Certified teacher, and Jennifer Wilson, High Qualified, K-5 teacher, .25 FTE Title VI-B Early Intervention and .75 FTE local and State funds. Valerie Haggans 1.0 FTE Title VI-B CEIS, a highly qualified paraprofessional based on Praxis results, was hired to collaborate with teachers and parents and work directly with elementary students identified as at-risk on DIBELS and other formative assessments. The students will work in flexible small groups,</p>	<p>Debra Heath, Principal; Sandra Hollaway, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

which will change throughout the year, based on learning needs. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Special Education				
3. Valerie Haggans, CEIS early intervention aide, will work with small intensive groups of kindergarten students who are not meeting benchmark on DIBELS assessments. These students will receive daily intervention for early literacy skills. They will be monitored with DIBELS every two weeks to assess progress. Donna Vaught, literacy coach, will guide instruction in the small group lessons, and she will meet regularly with Ms. Haggans and teachers to discuss the progress of at-risk students in order to change interventions as needed. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
6. Two highly qualified Early Interventionists, 1.0 FTE Cara Pribble and 1.0 FTE Melissa Wolgamot, based on Praxis results and college transcripts, will be hired 32 days to expand interventions for first and second grade students in literacy. The Interventionists will be paid by ARRA STIMULUS FUNDS CEIS and 148 days under Title I. They will be trained and work under the direction of the literacy coach and Title I Reading Specialist, providing intense small group interventions for students who exhibit the need for improvement according to DIBELS and other assessment data. The groups will be flexible throughout the year, based on student learning needs. Progress will be monitored every two weeks using DIBELS assessments. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Debra Heath, Principal	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. The K-8 Early Intervention Teachers and Aides will utilize research-based materials and strategies such as Texas Primary Reading Inventory, Barton Reading and Spelling Program, PATHS Program, Blue Print Phonics, and other effective instructional strategies recommended by the National Reading Panel and included in the Arkansas Reading First protocol. Materials, supplies and training will be purchased from TVI-B CEIS and district funds. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
7. Nancy Dunaway, early intervention teacher, will provide small group intensive interventions for students in the areas of math, literacy, and behavior. She will provide additional intervention time for students who have been retained or are not making adequate progress with other interventions, placing them at risk of referral for special education. Progress will be monitored utilizing behavioral data, DIBELS, and the kindergarten math check list. Action Type: Special Education	Debra Heath, Principal; Nancy Dunaway, Interventionist	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Three interventionists working under the direction of academic literacy and math coaches in grades 3-5 will work with at-risk students on behavioral and academic needs. They will have team meetings bi-weekly to monitor the progress of students and interventions. The interventionists are paid with stimulus funds. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Sandra Hollaway, Principal 3-5	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. Faculty and administrators at grade 3-5 level will receive training in referral process, data entry and data analysis. Data, previous years referrals, evaluations and placement procedures will be reviewed. Referrals for intensive early intervening services are made after initial remediation by Title I staff and interventionists based on the intervention pyramid. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Sandra Hollaway, Principal	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Title Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: The Barton Reading Program will be utilized as an intervention strategy for K-8 students who are not meeting desired benchmarks on DIBELS to help students attain reading skills needed to become proficient on grade level, and to prevent the need for referral or placement in special education.

Scientific Based Research: Significant Gains Demonstrated in Reading after Utilizing the Barton Reading and Spelling Program. Campbell, D. & Nosbisch, T. June 2009. [www.dys-add.com/FloridaCampbellStudy.pdf](http://www.dys-add.com/FloridaCampbellStudy.pdf) Components of Effective Reading

Instruction. Spear-Swerling,L.(2005).www. idonline.org/article. Benton School District-Benton, Arkansas. Intensive Reading Intervention Report for the School Year 2006-2007. <http://www.bartonreading.com/research2.html>.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
2. A site license for Barton Reading and Spelling was purchased for staff in grades K-8 along with materials, training, and professional consultants. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Pamela Evans, Certified Dyslexia Testing Specialist, National Board Certified Teacher, Certified Barton Trainer, and Tutor was hired to train grades K-8 Literacy coaches, Reading Recovery teachers, Title I teachers, Special Education teachers, and Early Interventionist in the Barton Reading and Spelling Program prior to the beginning of the 2009-2010 school year. She will continue to provide consultation throughout the year, including on site visits and additional professional development for staff members. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. The Barton Reading and Spelling Program will be added to the RTI tiers of intervention in grades K-5. K-5 Reading teachers, highly trained aides, early intervention teachers, Literacy coaches, and migrant tutor will use the Barton Program with individuals or small groups of students who show a need for this type of reading intervention. The success of the program will be evaluated throughout the year, utilizing DIBELS every two weeks with at-risk students. An annual evaluation will be completed by the building leadership team and special education district administrator using student achievement data collected during the year. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Debra Heath, Principal; Sandra Hollaway, Principal; Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. Students will be identified in grades K-8 using previous year's data and current DIBELS testing to determine what tier of intervention is needed to address deficits. Student progress will be monitored for the effectiveness of these interventions bi-weekly DIBELS assessments and other appropriate data. In grades 6-8 students will be provided early intervention literacy skills with the Barton Program one period each day at the Wynne Junior High School by highly qualified teachers who have been trained in the Barton method. Action Type: Special Education	Principals: Debra Heath, Sandra Hollaway, and David Stepp	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. Data on students targeted for early intervening assistance will be recorded in the special education module on early intervening services. Analysis of final data, at the end of May, on number of students served who did not ultimately need special education services will be used to consider continuation or modification of future early intervening services. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Co-Teaching will be implemented at the Junior High and High School to provide more support for those students who are identified as at-risk and to prevent the referral and placement of students in special education.

Scientific Based Research: Teaching Exceptional Children. Benefits of Co-Teaching in Secondary Mathematics Classes. Magiera, K., Smith, C., Zigmond, N., Gebauer, K. (Jan/Feb 2005) vol. 34 no.3. Tips and Strategies for Co-Teaching at the Secondary Level. Murawski, W. & Dieker, L. Teaching Exceptional Children. Vol. 36 no. 5 (2004). Leading In A Culture of Change. Fullan, M. (2001) Co-Instructing at the Secondary Level: Strategies for Success. Rice, N., Drame, E., Owens, L. & Frattura, E. Teaching Exceptional Children. Vol. 39. No. 6.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
2. Consultation services will be provided during the school year to work with staff of the Co-Teach model at the Wynne Junior High School. Staff will attend additional training out of district on Co-Teaching. Subs will be hired and expenses paid through ARRA FUNDS. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	David Stepp, Principal; Glenda Vance, Special Education Director	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

1. WJH staff, special education teachers: Wendy Stafford and Rachel Houston; two general education teachers: Lori Cothran and Robin Bethel; administrators: David Stepp and Blake Marsh; Literacy and math coaches, Bundy Hickey and Sharon Sisk have been trained in the Co-Teaching method which was implemented in 2009-2010 school year. Co-teach models are being used in both 7th and 8th grade math and literacy classes for the 2011-2012 school year. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Students will be monitored for progress using the DIBELS in Literacy and TLI Interim Assessments in Literacy and Mathematics. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	David Stepp, Principal	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. Teachers will be sent to additional professional development on Co-Teaching at the Crowley's Ridge CO/OP, in state workshops, out of state conferences, and receive in-house training from Highly Qualified Trainers. Subs will be hired and expenses paid from ARRA STIMULUS FUNDS. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Director; Principals	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 09/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
6. Implement CO-TEACHING in 9th - 11th grade to address the needs of IEP sub-populations. Students will be evaluated with TLI interim assessments and teacher observations. Special Ed teachers Dianna Roberts and Barbara Trevino will co-teach with regular classroom teachers Sunday Tyer, Karen Carrier, and Jackie Roberts using the co-teaching model in English and math. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Keith Watson, Principal; Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. A Co-Teaching model was implemented in grade 9 Biology to address the needs of at-risk students in the area of science in 2010. The Biology Co-Teaching program will be evaluated by teacher observation and teacher made-assessments. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Keith Watson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: The Auto Skills Literacy Program will be implemented at the High School to provide literacy supports to at-risk students to prevent the referral and placement of students in special education.

Scientific Based Research: Teaching Exceptional Children: Classwide Interventions: Effective Instruction Makes a Difference. Conroy, M., Sutherland, K., Snyder, A., Marsh, S. July/August 2008. Vol. 40 No. 6., p. 24-30. Teaching for Deep Comprehension: Dorn, L., & Soffos, C. 2005. Stenhouse Publishers.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
1. Purchase rights to Auto Skills Reading lab software to use in select English classes for all 9th/10th grade students who are identified with reading deficiencies as measured by reading assessments. The Auto Skills Program will be utilized to decrease special education referrals. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Keith Watson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. Students will be evaluated in the Auto Skills Literacy Program through the use of the prescriptive learning software component. Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Keith Watson, Principal	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: The Positive Behavior Support System will implemented in grades K-5 as a part of early intervention services to prevent the referral and placement of students in special education due to behavioral issues.

Scientific Based Research: Teaching Exceptional Children. Creating Home-School Partnerships by Engaging Families in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports. Muscott, H., Szczesiul, S., Berk, B., Staub, K., Hoover, J., Perry-Chisholm, P. Vol. 40 no. 6. The Educator's Guide to Preventing and Solving Discipline Problems. Boynton, C. & Boynton, M. 2005. Leading In A Culture of Change. Fullan, M. (2001). Teaching Esceptional Children. Positive Behavior Support Systems: Apply Key Features in Preschool Settings. Stormont, M. Lewis, T., & Beckner, R. Vol. 37 no. 6.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
1. Teachers will be trained in the Positive Behavior Support System (SPRINT Teams), PBSS materials purchased and the program will be implemented in grades K-5 over a two year period to provide interventions for those students identified as at-risk due to behavior issues. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Sandra Hollaway, Principal 3-5; Debra Heath, Principal K-2	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Arkansas Department of Education and State Improvement Grant was contracted for grades K-5 to provide training to teachers, counselors and administrators for the implementation of the program schoolwide in 2010-2012. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Sandra Hollaway, Principal 3-5; Debra Heath, Principal K-2	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. SPRINT teams, consisting of staff, administrators, outside health providers, and parents, will meet on a regular basis to determine if specific students need further support. Data will be collected and discussed during the team meetings. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education	Sandra Hollaway, Principal 3-5; Debra Heath, Principal K-2	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Title Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Formulate processes to review pre-referral, referrals, evaluation and placement of special education students.

Scientific Based Research: Educational Leadership: Using Data, Changing Teaching. Wade, B., & Trantham, P., Jan 2009. Vol. 66 No. 4. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Teaching Exceptional Children: Addressing Diversity in Schools: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. Brown, R. & Forde, T. Jan/Feb 2007. Vol.39 No.3. Annual Growth For All Students, Catch-Up Growth For Those Who Are Behind. Fielding, L., Kerr, N., & Rosier, P., 2007. The New Foundation Press, Inc., Kennewick, WA.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
2. Professional Development will be provided for faculty and administrators at all building levels by special education supervisor, Glenda Vance, in pre-referral problem solving process, and early intervention entries. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Special education and general education staff will collaborate and formulate ideas for accommodations and interventions that can be implemented for struggling students. Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. Train staff to review and analyze referral data from previous years by building, grade level, and source of referral to determine patterns of student placement in special education. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education	Glenda Vance, Special Education Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 7: English Language Learners

Supporting Data:

- In the spring of 2011, five students grade K, 9, 10, and two 11 took the ELDA English Language Development Assessment. One Chinese, one Hispanic, and three Asian students completed the exam with a Mean Scale Score: Comprehension: for Hispanic student - grade 09 male Level 5 scale 950, Asian student - grade 10 Level 1 scale 442; Asian student - male Level 2 scale 589, Asian student- female Level 1 scale 519; Chinese student- female Level 3, scale 151. Four of the students Level 3 or below concluding the areas of greatest need was in Speaking, Reading, Listening and Writing. In the spring of 2009, eight students grades 01, 03, 07, 09, 10, and 11 took the ELDA English Language Development Assessment. Five Hispanic students completed the exam with a Mean Scale Score: Comprehension: for Hispanic students - grade 01 male Level 4 and female Level 5, grade 03 female Level 4, grade 07 male Level 5, grade 11 female Level 4; for Chinese students -grade 9 two females Level 2, grade 10 male Level 1. The three Chinese students scored Level 2 & Level 1 concluding the areas of greatest need was in Speaking, Reading and Writing.
- In the spring of 2008, five students grades k, 02, 06, and 10 took the ELDA English Language Development Assessment. Four Hispanic and one Asian/Pacific Islander students completed the exam with a Mean Scale Score: Comprehension, four Hispanic students grade K female Level 4, grade 02 female Level 3, grade 06 male Level 3, grade 10 female Level 3, and one Asian/Pacific Islander student grade 02 female Level 05. The grade 02 Hispanic student's concern areas are equally consistent in all five language domains: listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension. The grade 06 & 10 students' area of concern is in reading.
- The Student Profile Sheets, LAS -O Language Proficiency Score given at the entry of students to school indicated one student scored an (L) Level 1 Asian/Pacific Islander student scored an (L) Limited English Speaker.

Goal To ensure that all ELL students attain academic proficiency in the five domains: reading, writing, speaking, listening, and comprehension.

Benchmark The ELL students will advance 1 proficiency level or more based on the ELDA scores.

Intervention: Tutorial support will be provided by multi-language staff and students.				
Scientific Based Research: Differentiated Instructional Strategies: One Size Doesn't Fit All. Chapman, C., & Gregory, G., 2002. Corwin Press, Inc. Classroom Instruction that works with English Language Learners. Flynn, K., & Hill, J. 2006. Associationfor Supervision and Curriculum Development. A Parent's Guide to Tutors and Tutoring: How to Support the Unique Needs of Your Child. (2008). Mendelsohn, J. Jossey-Bass.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
1. The tutorial program will be carried out in the least restrictive environment to eliminate any barriers during school day with students, school staff and community volunteers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Marjorie Crawford, ELL Tutor; Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. Tutors and/or consultants will be hired with ELL funds at \$35.00 per hour after and before school to emphasize access to core content and assist students in becoming competent in the five language domains and to support the ELL students. Materials and supplies will be purchased from ELL funds to assist the ELL students to become successful. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity	Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal For students to achieve academic equality with non-ELL peers.

Benchmark The number of ELL students will increase their skills and communication of the English Language during the current 2011-2012 school year.

Intervention: To team ELL students with Non-ELL peers. The success of the peer teaming will be visually measured by the positive interaction between the ELL and Non-ELL students.				
Scientific Based Research: Educational Leadership: Poverty and Learning. Understanding Students' Strengths and Struggles. San Antonio, D. M., April 2008, Vol. 65, No. 6. Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development. Classroom Instruction that works with English Language Learners. Flynn, K., & Hill, J. 2006. Associationfor Supervision and Curriculum Development.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
2. Peer Tutoring will be offered with ELL and Non-ELL students in core content subject to increase English understanding. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Keith Watson, Principal	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. Non-ELL teachers will work closely with ELL (Spanish Asian, and Chinese) teachers, media specialist, computer specialist, and students to develop a program to be carried out in the least restrictive environment that will emphasize proficiency in the English language. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor; Building Principals	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>School Library</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Purchase software and materials to support the peer tutorial program for ELL students. (funded in Goal 1) Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Goal For ELL students to gain cultural competence and cross-cultural experiences.

Benchmark To increase collaborate academic, cultural and social success through practice and observation.

Intervention: Provide opportunities for parent involvement in the classroom and at school events.				
Scientific Based Research: Educational Leadership: Poverty and Learning. Whose School Is It? Rooney, J., April 2008, Vol. 65, No. 6. Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development. Classroom Instruction that works with English Language Learners. Flynn, K., & Hill, J. 2006. Associationfor Supervision and Curriculum Development.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

1. Schedule timelines for parents and relatives of ELL students to visit in classroom and share culture experiences. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor; Building Principals	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. Collaborate and organize with local social agencies and community to meet the academic, cultural and social needs of the ELL students and family. Action Type: Collaboration	Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor, Building Principals	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Connect with local organizations, (Literacy Counsel, churches, civic organizations, teachers, and educational cooperative) which provide special services to unique cultures of our ELL families. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. Provide tutorial services to support the ELL students and families to increase parental involvement and participation in the students academic progress. Materials and supplies will be purchased from ELL funds. (funded in HS ACSIP) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
7. The level of English proficiency will be determined in ELL students by administering pre and post assessments for the tutorial program. Action Type: Equity	Marjorie Crawford, ELL Tutor; Carl Easley, ELL Supervisor	Start: 08/17/2011 End: 05/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
6. Families of ELL students will be contacted and welcome into the school district through new family orientation and welcome family packets. The district parent coordinator is available to help parents and students with cultural transition. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Marjorie Crawford, ELL Tutor; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 08/17/2011 End: 05/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 8: The Wynne School District will provide administrative leadership and support essential to student performance at grade level in literacy and mathematics on state assessed curriculum.

- Wynne Primary A review of data by the leadership team and faculty revealed item analysis from 2011 norm referenced data indicate the following regarding specific skills: In kindergarten, students score significantly higher than the nation on the ITBS Summary Report for 2011. Out of 228 students 184 scored at the 81% which is significantly higher than the norm group, 206 of 228 students scored at 90%, and in math 171 of 228 scored at the 75% indicating that this is not an area of concern. In 2010 first grade scored significantly higher on 20 out of 40 items, and they did not score significantly lower than the norm on any items. Second grade scored significantly higher than the norm group on 20 out of 40 items. However, on the functional content cluster, there were 4 items the group scored significantly lower than the norm including: forming hypothesis from ideas in text, discerning the speaker's voice, determining explicit supporting details, and drawing conclusions from details. Instruction on these skills will be enhanced in second grade literacy lesson plans through the work of the literacy coach and teachers. Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) end of year assessment results indicate the following students met standards over the last three years: 2009 Kindergarten- 81% in letter naming fluency 1st grade- 77% in oral reading fluency 2nd grade- 70% in oral reading fluency. The decrease in the number of kindergarten students reaching the benchmark for letter naming fluency in 2009 indicates the need for more targeted small group intervention by classroom teachers. Additionally, the intervention aide received training and will implement instructional strategies from Barton Reading Program in groups of reduced size compared to 2008. The size of intervention groups will also be decreased in first and second grade with the addition of two more intervention aides hired with stimulus dollars. Second grade will continue daily fluency practice and more attention will be given to decoding multisyllabic words during word study lessons in order to improve fluency. A review of data by the leadership team and faculty revealed the following regarding performance on SAT-10 in spring, 2008: In the area of reading comprehension, 47% of first grade students were above the 50th percentile, which was slightly above the state average. 73% of the combined population in first grade were proficient or advanced according to ADE cut scores. Further analysis indicates that 57% of African American students, 63% of students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, and 40% of students with IEP's were proficient. In the second grade combined population, 41% of students scored above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. According to ADE cut scores, 65% of the combined population were proficient or advanced. Scores from sub-populations in 2nd grade indicate that 50% of African American students, 61% of students from disadvantage economic backgrounds, and 18 % of IEP students were proficient or above. These scores indicate that continued interventions with students from sub-populations are needed in foundational reading skill areas to improve comprehension, and reduce the gap between the subpopulations and combined population in reading comprehension. Research-based core curriculum and interventions will be provided by the classroom teacher and additional strategies will be used by intervention teachers. The success of intervention and progress of students is monitored at regular Intervention Team meetings. Math Primary 2008

spring performance on the SAT-10 has been analyzed by the leadership team and faculty. Of the combined population of first grade students, 59% scored above the 50th percentile, which was above the state average. 71% were proficient according to ADE cut scores. Subpopulation scores indicate that 56% of African American students, 61% of students from disadvantaged economic backgrounds, and 53% of IEP students were proficient or advanced according to ADE cut scores. Second grade scores were as follows: 62% of the combined population scored above the 50th percentile, which was above the state average. According to ADE cut scores, 56% of students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, 42% of African American students, and 18% of IEP students were proficient. Data analysis by the leadership team and faculty included discussion in the achievement gap between the combined population and sub-groups. Interventions will continue for students in the sub-populations. The interventions will be provided by the regular classroom teachers and intervention teachers; progress of individual students will be monitored in the Intervention Team meetings. The Average Daily Attendance was as follows: 2007-2008 94.4%, 2008-2009 95.6%, 2009-2010 94.3% remaining stable over the course of three years.

2. Wynne Intermediate School Intermediate Literacy On the 2010-11 Arkansas Augmented Literacy Assessment 81.8% of all students enrolled at WIS scored proficient or advanced in literacy. The grade level scores are as follows: Grade 3 Percent Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 82, African American: 64.6, Caucasian: 91, Economic Disadvantaged: 76, Students with Disabilities: 36, Grade 4 Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 85, African American: 73, Caucasian: 90, Economic Disadvantaged: 81, Students with Disabilities: 48, Grade 5 Percent Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 77, African American: 60, Caucasian: 85, Economic Disadvantaged: 69, Students with Disabilities: 0 Third grade students scored higher on the multiple choice items than the open response items. Content Reading is the lowest scoring multiple choice passage type for third grade; however, this score was significantly higher than the state average. Additionally, third graders were more successful on the multiple choice writing items than the open response writing responses. Fourth grade students scored higher on the literacy multiple choice items than the open response items. Practical multiple choice passage types were the lowest literacy skill area; however the average score was higher than the state average. Fifth grade students scored higher on the open response reading items than the multiple choice items. Content was the lowest scoring passage. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills Assessment was the NRT given in 2010-2011 and we do not have any established baseline data. Third grade students scored 55% at above the national percentile range in reading comprehension. Fourth grade students 55.3% and fifth grade students scored 45.8%. African American students scored lower than the Caucasian students in all three grades. 2010 SAT-10-Reading Comprehension In the area of Reading Comprehension, all groups scored at or above the state average except for our Hispanic Males who were below the state in 3rd and 5th grades. Our 3rd grade Hispanic Males scored 24% compared to 51% in the state and our 5th grade Males in the same group ranked in the 67th percentile which is slightly lower than the state at the 70th percentile. Our IEP students scored below the state in 3rd grade with a score in the 67th% compared to 20th% and 4th grade we scored at the 20th % and the state average was in the 19th. Our Free and Reduced sub population scored slightly below the state in 4th and 5th grades with our 4th grade students scoring in the 55th % and the state in the 57th %. In 5th grade on this portion of the exam, our Free and Red students scored 44% compared to the state scoring 47% 2010 SAT 10 Comprehensive Language Our combined population on the NRT for Comprehensive Language scored below the state average in 3rd and 4th grades and equal to the state in 5th grade. In looking at our sub groups on this portion of the exam, we were slightly below the state average in all sub groups except for our Hispanic students in the 3rd and 5th grades who scored considerably higher. Our Hispanic students scored 44% in 3rd grade compared to the state average of 29%. In 5th grade our Hispanic population scored 54% and the state scored 39%. Our IEP students were below the state scores in 3rd and 4th grades. IEP students in 3rd grade scored 10% and the state scored 14% and 4th grade IEP students scored 9% compared to the state score of 14%. Our 5th grade IEP students were slightly above the state average with a score of 22% and the state 19%. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Third Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 43rd percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 26th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 11th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 34th percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Third Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 36th percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 21st percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 10th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 27th percentile rank. Overall, Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Third Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Fourth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 58th percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 40th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 29th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 51st percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Fourth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 44th percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 25th percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 12th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 27th percentile rank. Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Fourth Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Fifth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 52nd percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 36th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 5th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 41st percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Fifth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 43rd percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 33rd percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 14th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 36th percentile rank. Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Fifth Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups except for the IEP subgroup as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT. On the 2011 Third Grade Literacy Benchmark Exam, 69% of the Combined Population Students scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the exam. Of that group, 50% of the African American Students scored

proficient or advanced while 27% of Students with Disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on the test, and the Economically Disadvantaged Students scored 60% at or above the proficiency level of the Benchmark Exam. Our overall Combined Population Students dropped from 73% to 69% on the Benchmark. There was a decrease in the proficient/advanced level in all sub-populations groups from 2008 to 2009. The lowest identified area in literacy was the open-response questions of the reading passages. The highest gain was on the multiple choice area of the content reading passages for the Combined Population and all sub-population groups. Open-response continued to be the weakest area of the reading portion of the Third Grade Benchmark Exam. 69% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or above on the writing portion of the Third Grade Benchmark Exam. Usage was identified as the strongest area while content and style continued to be out weakest areas of the test. Fourth Graders in 2009, 68% of the Combined Population Students scored at or above proficient and advanced on the Fourth Grade Literacy portion of the Benchmark Exam. Of that group, 48% of the African American Students scored at or above the proficient level on the test. 27% of the Students with Disabilities were at or above the proficient level and the Economically Disadvantaged Students scored 60% proficient or advanced on the Fourth Grade Benchmark Exam. The Combined Population Students' scores increased from 62% to 68% on the literacy portion of the Benchmark Exam, and there was a slight increase for all sub-populations on the literacy section of the exam. Although open-response continued to be a weakness for both the combined and sub-populations students, the lowest identified area in reading was the practical multiple choice portion. On the writing multiple choice portion of the Fourth Grade Benchmark Exam, 65% of the Combined Population Students scored proficient or advanced with usage being the strong area and content and style identified as the two weakest areas on the test. The Combined Fifth Grade Population scored 66% at or above the proficient level on the literacy portion of the 2009 Benchmark Exam. Of that group, 51% of the African American Students scored proficient or advanced on the 2009 Literacy Benchmark Exam. 8% of the Students with Disabilities and 55% of the Economically Disadvantaged Students scored at or above on the literacy portion of the 2009 Benchmark Exam. Our overall Combined Population's scores increased from 59% to 66% on the 2009 Literacy Benchmark Exam. There was a significant increase in the African American and the Economically Disadvantaged sub-population groups, but a slight decrease in the scores for the Students with Disabilities from previous years on the 2009 exam. The weakest area identified in literacy for all sub-populations was the practical reading in both the multiple choice and open response sections of the Benchmark Exam. 75% of the Combined Population scored proficient or advanced on the writing multiple choice sections with content and style being the weakest areas and usage identified as the strongest area of the writing portion of the 2009 Benchmark Exam. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Third Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 43rd percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 26th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 11th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 34th percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Third Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 36th percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 21st percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 10th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 27th percentile rank. Overall, Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Third Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Fourth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 58th percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 40th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 29th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 51st percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Fourth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 44th percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 25th percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 12th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 27th percentile rank. Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Fourth Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our Fifth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 52nd percentile rank on Reading Comprehension. Of that group, the African American Students scored in the 36th percentile rank, the IEP Students scored in the 5th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 41st percentile rank. On the Comprehensive Language portion of the 2009 NRT Augmented Benchmark Exam, the Fifth Grade Combined Population Students scored in the 43rd percentile rank. Of that population, the African American Students scored in the 33rd percentile rank, IEP Students scored in the 14th percentile rank, and the Free and Reduced Students scored in the 36th percentile rank. Comprehensive Language scores were lower in the Fifth Grade Combined Population Students and all other subgroups except for the IEP subgroup as compared to the Reading Comprehension scores of the NRT.

Intermediate Math Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Data On the 2009 3rd grade benchmark exam, 86% of the combined population of students scored at or above proficient on the math portion of the test. Of African American sub-populations, 74% scored proficient or advanced. 46% of students with disabilities passed the exam. Of the economically disadvantaged Group, 79% scored proficient or advanced. Scores for combined populations dropped from 87% to 86% from 2008 to 2009, but there was an 11% increase from 2007 to 2009. The most significant deficient areas were in Number Sense and Operations and Algebra. Open response continues to be weaker than multi-choice. Of fourth grade combined population students, 83% scored in the proficient or advanced category. 68% of the African American sub-population scored proficient or advanced on the 2009 benchmark exam. 41% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced, and 80% of the economically disadvantaged students were at or above the proficient level. A three year trend shows a steady increase of scores. The 2007 combined score was 66%, 2008 was 82%, and 2009 83%. The area of concern in math for 4th grade students is in measurement. There was a drop from 2008 to 2009 of 67% to 56%. Open response average continues to be lower than the multi-choice average. In 2009, 77% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the benchmark exam. The African Americans scored 70% in proficient and advanced levels. Students with disabilities scored 29% proficient or above. Economically disadvantaged students scored 69% proficient or advanced. Students scoring proficient or advanced in the combined population increased from 74% in 2008 to 75% in 2009. There was a decrease in all five strands in 2009. Measurement showed the most significant decrease. The data went from 63.8% in 2008 to 46.5% in 2009. Open response scores were

weaker than multi-choice in all 5 strands in 2009. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our combined population of 3rd grade students scored in the 60th percentile on math problem solving portion. Our African American subgroup scored in the 43rd percentile with economically disadvantaged students scoring in the 51st percentile. IEP students scored 26%. (Math problem solving was the only area tested for 3rd grade in math) 4th grade combined population students scored the same or better than 72% of the students in the Nation on the math problem solving section of the NRT portion of the 2009 Augmented Benchmark Exam. Our African American students scored in the 54th percentile on the math problem solving. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 64th percentile and IEP students scored in the 46th percentile. On the 2009 math problem solving portion of the Augmented Benchmark Exam, our 5th grade students scored in the 77th percentile in the combined population segment of the test. 5th grade African American students scored 65% on this exam with economically disadvantaged students scoring 61%, and IEP students 25%. On the science portion of the 2009 NRT for the combined population, the 5th grade students scored in the 62nd percentile. African American students in this group scored in the 45th percentile, and economically disadvantaged students scored 50%, IEP students scored the same or above 28% of the students in the Nation. 85% of all 3, 4, 5, grade students at Wynne Intermediate School (WIS) scored proficient and advanced on the 2010 Augmented Math Assessment. Grade 3 Percent Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 91 African American: 81 Caucasian: 95 Economic Disadvantaged: 89 Students with Disabilities: 52 Grade 4 Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 81 African American: 72 Caucasian: 86 Economic Disadvantaged: 74 Students with Disabilities: 28 Grade 5 Percent Proficient/Advanced Combined Population: 77 African American: 58 Caucasian: 84 Economic Disadvantaged: 67 Students with Disabilities: 48 The 2010 Augmented Assessment data indicates that measurement is the lowest scoring strand in all three grades. Even though this is the lowest scoring strand, third grade and fifth grade students scored higher than the state average. WIS students scored lower on open response questions than multiple choice items. Geometry was the lowest scoring open response questions for third grade students and fifth grade students. The fourth grade students scored lower on the Data Analysis and Probability open response question, yet they were higher than the state average. Regarding the 2009 data, 3rd grade benchmark exam, 86% of the combined population of students scored at or above proficient on the math portion of the test. Of African American sub-populations, 74% scored proficient or advanced. 46% of students with disabilities passed the exam. Of the economically disadvantaged Group, 79% scored proficient or advanced. The most significant deficient areas were in Number Sense and Operations and Algebra. Open response continues to be weaker than multi-choice. Of fourth grade combined population students, 83% scored in the proficient or advanced category. 68% of the African American sub-population scored proficient or advanced on the 2009 benchmark exam. 41% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced, and 80% of the economically disadvantaged students were at or above the proficient level. A three year trend shows a steady increase of scores. The 2008 was 82%, and 2009 83%. The area of concern in math for 4th grade students is in measurement. There was a drop from 2008 to 2009 of 67% to 56%. Open response average continues to be lower than the multi-choice average. In 2009, 77% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the benchmark exam. The African Americans scored 70% in proficient and advanced levels. Students with disabilities scored 29% proficient or above. Economically disadvantaged students scored 69% proficient or advanced. Students scoring proficient or advanced in the combined population increased from 74% in 2008 to 75% in 2009. There was a decrease in all five strands in 2009. Measurement showed the most significant decrease. The data went from 63.8% in 2008 to 46.5% in 2009. Open response scores were weaker than multi-choice in all 5 strands in 2009. The 2010 SAT 10 Math Problem Solving indicates that the combined population students in our school were at or above the state average for Math Problem Solving in all sub groups of the exam except for the I.E.P. students in the 3rd and 4th grades. 3rd grade IEP students scored at the 16th percentile with the state score being at the 27th percentile. 4th grade IEP students were at the 23rd percentile compared to the state at the 34th percentile. On the 2009 NRT section of the Augmented Benchmark, our combined population of 3rd grade students scored in the 60th percentile on math problem solving portion. Our African American subgroup scored in the 43rd percentile with economically disadvantaged students scoring in the 51st percentile. IEP students scored 26%. (Math problem solving was the only area tested for 3rd grade in math) 4th grade combined population students scored the same or better than 72% of the students in the Nation on the math problem solving section of the NRT portion of the 2009 Augmented Benchmark Exam. Our African American students scored in the 54th percentile on the math problem solving. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 64th percentile and IEP students scored in the 46th percentile. On the 2009 math problem solving portion of the Augmented Benchmark Exam, our 5th grade students scored in the 77th percentile in the combined population segment of the test. 5th grade African American students scored 65% on this exam with economically disadvantaged students scoring 61%, and IEP students 25%. On the science portion of the 2009 NRT for the combined population, the 5th grade students scored in the 62nd percentile. African American students in this group scored in the 45th percentile, and economically disadvantaged students scored 50%, IEP students scored the same or above 28% of the students in the Nation. The 2009-2010 WIS CRT pre/post assessment data is noted: the following data is noted: third grade students scored an average of 23.4 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 21.9 on out of 40 on open response items on the post test. The fourth grade students ended the year with an average 21.6 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 22.5 on open response items. Fifth Grade students scored 19.6 out of 32 on the multiple choice items and 21.2 out of 40 on the open response items. All grade made significant improvement on the WIS CRT exam. In reviewing the results of the 2008-2009 Wynne Intermediate CRT post-test, the following data is noted: third grade students scored an average of 22 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 21.5 on out of 40 on open response items on the post test. The fourth grade students ended the year with an average 22.6 out of 32 on multiple choice items and 24.8 out of 40 on open response items. Fifth Grade students scored 20.9 out of 32 on the multiple choice items and 21.1 out of 40 on the open response items. All grade made significant improvement on the WIS CRT exam. Students with Disabilities are consistently scoring lower than the other sub-populations students especially in the area of Data Analysis, Probability and Geometry. Open response questions are still a challenge for the Students with Disabilities. The average daily attendance for 2009-2010 is 95.2% which is an improvement from the 94.3% average daily attendance for 2008 2009. The Average Daily Attendance was as follows: 2007-2008 94.3%, 2008-2009 94.3%, 2009-2010 95.5% increased while remaining stable over the course of three years.

Supporting  
Data:

3. WJH Literacy GR 6-8 1-A. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam 2008-9 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 students:67.9% of Combined Students 58 students:51.7% of African/American Students 2 students:100% of Hispanic Students 160 students:71.9% of Caucasian Students 122 students:55.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 students: N/A of LEP Students 24 students: 8.3% of Students with Disabilities 2009-10 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (215 Students Tested) 138 Students: 64% of Combined Students 32 Students: 46% of African American Students 105 Students: 73% of Caucasian Students 71 Students: 55% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-11 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (192 Students Tested) 148 Students: 77% of Combined Students 46 Students: 65% of African American Students 100 Students: 84% of Caucasian Students 80 Students: 70% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 227 Students: 62% of Combined Students 72 Students: 48.0% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 151 Students: 68% of Caucasian Students 144 Students: 54% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 38 Students: 13% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Literary Passage and writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response was Content Passage and Content/Style in Writing. 1-B. Benchmark-7th Grade Literacy Exam 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 60.9% of Combined Students 80 Students: 37.5% of African/American Students 5 Students: 80% of Hispanic Students 114 Students: 71.7% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 48.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 7.0% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (214 Students Tested) 154 Students: 72% of Combined Students 28 Students: 52% of African American Students 122 Students: 78% of Caucasian Students 68 Students: 58% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (211 Students Tested) 152 Students: 72% of Combined Students 39 Students: 61% of African American Students 112 Students: 76% of Caucasian Students 81 Students: 65% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 7 Students: 21% of Students with Disabilities 2010-11 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 193 Students: 66% of Combined Students 70 Students: 60% of African American Students 3 Students: 66.0% of Hispanic Students 119 Students: 69% of Caucasian Students 112 Students: 58% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 16 Students: 6% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Literary Passage and writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response in Literary Passage and Content/Style in Writing. 1-C. Benchmark-8th Grade Literacy Exam 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 45.2% of African/American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 172 Students: 81.4% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 56.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 10.7% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (257 Students Tested) 176 Students: 68% of Combined Students 44 Students: 53% of African American Students 127 Students: 76% of Caucasian Students 84 Students: 59% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (216 Students Tested) 185 Students: 86% of Combined Students 38 Students: 72% of African American Students 144 Students: 90% of Caucasian Students 91 Students: 80% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 3 Students: 14% of Students with Disabilities 2010-2011 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 72% of Combined Students 66 Students: 59% of African American Students 1 Student: 0% of Hispanic Students 141 Students: 77% of Caucasian Students 125 Students: 64% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 16% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response in Literary and Content Passage and Content/Style domain in Writing. Stanford-10 Achievement Test Scores 2008 administration National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE: Gr 8 (combined) Reading Comprehension 52% Comprehensive Language 41% Gr 7 (combined) Reading Comprehension 49% Comprehensive Language 38% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 49% Comprehensive Language 47% Stanford-10 Achievement Test Scores 2009 administration National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE: Gr 8 (combined) Reading Comprehension 48.3% Comprehensive Language 43.8% Gr 7 (combined) Reading Comprehension 52.5% Comprehensive Language 48.3% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 45% Comprehensive Language 44.6% Iowa Test of Basic Skills Achievement Test Scores 2011 administration National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE: Gr 8 (combined) Reading Comprehension 52% Comprehensive Language 53% Gr 7 (combined) Reading Comprehension 48% Comprehensive Language 49% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 41% Comprehensive Language 46% Iowa Test of Basic Skills Achievement Test Scores 2010 administration National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE: Gr 8 (combined) Reading Comprehension 62% Comprehensive Language 53% Gr 7 (combined) Reading Comprehension 52% Comprehensive Language 46% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 46% Comprehensive Language 47% Stanford-10 Achievement Test Scores 2009 administration National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE: Gr 8 (combined) Reading Comprehension 48.3% Comprehensive Language 43.8% Gr 7 (combined) Reading Comprehension 52.5% Comprehensive Language 48.3% Gr 6 (combined) Reading Comprehension 45% Comprehensive Language 44.6% 1-A. Benchmark-6th Grade Literacy Exam 2008-9 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 218 students:67.9% of Combined Students 58 students:51.7% of African/American Students 2 students:100% of Hispanic Students 160 students:71.9% of Caucasian Students 122 students:55.7% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 students: N/A of LEP Students 24 students: 8.3% of Students with Disabilities 2009-10 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (215 Students Tested) 138 Students: 64% of Combined Students 32 Students: 46% of African American Students 105 Students: 73% of Caucasian Students 71 Students: 55% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (192 Students Tested) 148 Students: 77% of Combined Students 46 Students: 65% of African American Students 100 Students: 84% of Caucasian Students 80 Students: 70% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-11 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 227 Students: 62% of Combined Students 72 Students: 48.0% of African American Students 2 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 151 Students: 68% of Caucasian Students 144 Students: 54% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 38 Students: 13% of Students with

Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Literary Passage and writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response was Content Passage and Content/Style in Writing. 1-B. Benchmark-7th Grade Literacy Exam 2008-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 60.9% of Combined Students 80 Students: 37.5% of African/American Students 5 Students: 80% of Hispanic Students 114 Students: 71.7% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 48.9% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 7.0% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (214 Students Tested) 154 Students: 72% of Combined Students 28 Students: 52% of African American Students 122 Students: 78% of Caucasian Students 68 Students: 58% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (211 Students Tested) 152 Students: 72% of Combined Students 39 Students: 61% of African American Students 112 Students: 76% of Caucasian Students 81 Students: 65% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 7 Students: 21% of Students with Disabilities 2010-11 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 193 Students: 66% of Combined Students 70 Students: 60% of African American Students 3 Students: 66.0% of Hispanic Students 119 Students: 69% of Caucasian Students 112 Students: 58% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 16 Students: 6% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Literary Passage and writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response in Literary Passage and Content/Style in Writing. 1-C. Benchmark-8th Grade Literacy Exam 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 45.2% of African/American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 172 Students: 81.4% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 56.1% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 10.7% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (257 Students Tested) 176 Students: 68% of Combined Students 44 Students: 53% of African American Students 127 Students: 76% of Caucasian Students 84 Students: 59% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: 0% of Students with Disabilities 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (216 Students Tested) 185 Students: 86% of Combined Students 38 Students: 72% of African American Students 144 Students: 90% of Caucasian Students 91 Students: 80% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 3 Students: 14% of Students with Disabilities 2010-2011 Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 72% of Combined Students 66 Students: 59% of African American Students 1 Student: 0% of Hispanic Students 141 Students: 77% of Caucasian Students 125 Students: 64% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 16% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Writing in Multiple Choice, Open Response in Literary and Content Passage and Content/Style domain in Writing. Benchmark-6th Grade Mathematics Exam 2008 - # Tested and Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced 218 Students: 78.4% of Combined Students 58 Students: 63.8% of African/American Students 157 Students: 83.4% of Caucasian Students 123 Students: 69.9% of Economically Disadvantaged Students 1 Student: 100% of LEP Students 24 Students: 25.0% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (215 Students Tested) 173 Students: 80.4% of Combined Students 46 Students: 66% of African American Students 128 Students: 89% of Caucasian Students 98 Students: 75 % of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 17 Students: 44% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified area for the combined population was: Measurement in Open Response. Data Analysis in Multiple Choice. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (192 Students Tested) 163 Students: 85% of Combined Students 52 Students: 73% of African American Students 109 Students: 92% of Caucasian Students 90 Students: 78% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 6 Students: 38% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified area for the combined population was: Measurement in Open Response. Data Analysis in Multiple Choice. 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 227 Students: 78% of Combined Students 72 Students: 61% of African American Students 2 Students: 100% of Hispanic Students 151 Students: 82% of Caucasian Students 144 Students: 67% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 38 Students: 26% of Students with Disabilities Benchmark-7th Grade Mathematics Exam 2008 - # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 248 Students: 76.2% of Combined Students 80 Students: 56.3% of African/American Students 160 Students: 85.6% of Caucasian Students 141 Students: 65.4% of Economically Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 17.9% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (214 Students Tested) 176 Students: 82% of Combined Students 41 Students: 76% of African American Students 131 Students: 84% of Caucasian Students 86 Students: 74% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 4 Students: 19% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Number and Operations in Open Response. Geometry in Multiple Choice. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (211 Students Tested) 179 Students: 84% of Combined Students 46 Students: 73% of African American Students 132 Students: 89% of Caucasian Students 97 Students: 78% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 12 Students: 35% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Data Analysis/Probability in Open Response. Data Analysis/Probability in Multiple Choice. 2011-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 193 Students: 87.0% of Combined Students 80 Students: 79.0% of African American Students 3 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 119 Students: 91.0% of Caucasian Students 112 Students: 83.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A % of LEP Students 16 Students: 32.0% of Students with Disabilities. Benchmark-8th Grade Mathematics Exam 2008 # Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced 249 Students: 71.1% of Combined Students 73 Students: 41.1% of African/American Students 172 Students: 83.1% of Caucasian Students 139 Students: 52.5% of Economically Disadvantaged Students 28 Students: 17.6% of Students with Disabilities 2009-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (257 Students Tested) 187 Students: 72% of Combined Students 45 Students: 54% of African American Students 138 Students: 83% of Caucasian Students 89 Students: 60% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 4 Students: 15% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Number/Operations and Geometry strands with both Multiple Choice & Open Response. 2010-# Tested & Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: (216 Students Tested) 170 Students: 79% of Combined Students 34 Students: 64% of African American Students 133 Students: 83% of Caucasian Students 79 Students: 69% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 3 Students: 14% of Students with Disabilities The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Number/Operations in Open Response. Data Analysis/Probability in Multiple Choice. 2011-# Tested &

Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: 209 Students: 74.0% of Combined Students 66 Students: 65.0% of African American Students 1 Students: 100.0% of Hispanic Students 141 Students: 77.0 % of Caucasian Students 125 Students: 71.0% of Econ. Disadvantaged Students 0 Students: N/A% of LEP Students 31 Students: 13.0% of Students with Disabilities ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2008 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 61.8% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 56.7% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 63.6% ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2009 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 67% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 63% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 75% ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2010 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 71% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 66% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 77% ITBS Achievement Test Scores National Percentile Rank of Mean National NCE 2011 Administration Grade 6 Mathematics Problem Solving: 57% Grade 7 Mathematics Problem Solving: 59% Grade 8 Mathematics Problem Solving: 60% The Average Daily Attendance was as follows: 2007-2008 94.3%, 2008-2009 94.5%, 2009-2010 95.2% increased while remaining stable over the course of three years.

4. Wynne High School The Graduation Rate: 2010 94.7%, 2009 95.3%, 2008 94.9% WYNNE HIGH SCHOOL IS Targeted Intensive Improvement (TII-4) FOR LITERACY Because in 2010-2011 Wynne High School's COMBINED POPULATION SCORED 62.5% PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED AND OUR AFRICAN AMERICAN GROUP IMPROVED TO 39.2% .Our economically disadvantaged group improved to 50.6% proficient and advanced up from to 41.8% proficient and advanced. The lowest identified areas of weakness in reading for the combined population, which includes the African-American population, the Economically Disadvantaged population, and the Students with Disabilities population, were the literary and content passages. In 2010-11, 61% of the combined students scored at or above proficient on the GR 11 Literacy Exam, 39% of African American students scored at or above proficient, 71% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient, 49% economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient, N/A of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas of weakness in writing for the Combined Population was the multiple choice questions with a 71.9% average; African-American population with a 61.5% average; Economically Disadvantaged population with a 66.1% average. The other areas of weakness for the African-American population were content and style with an average of 71.9%. The other areas of weakness for the Economically Disadvantaged population were content with an average of 76.0 and style with an average of 76.2%. In 2009, 56% of the combined students scored at or above proficient on the GR 11 Literacy Exam, 33% of African American students scored at or above proficient, 68% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient, 35% disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient, N/A of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas of weakness for combined population students were content passage and practical passage open response questions. The lowest identifies areas of weakness for African American students were content passage open response questions. The lowest identified area of weakness for Caucasian students were content passage open response questions. The lowest identified areas of weakness of students who are economically disadvantaged were content passage open response questions. The lowest identified area of weakness for students with disabilities were content passage open response questions. In 2008, 48% of the combined students scored at or above proficient on the GR 11 Literacy Exam, 14% of African American students scored at or above proficient, 59.9% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient, 28.9% of economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient, N/A of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient, The lowest identified areas of weakness for combined population students were: Content passage and practical passage open response questions, The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Content passage open response questions, The lowest identified area of weakness for Caucasian students were content passage open response questions, The lowest identified areas of weakness of students who are economically disadvantaged were: content passage open response questions, The lowest identified area of weakness for students with disabilities were: Content passage open response questions. Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITBS): 2011 Literacy: 48% of all students scored above the 50th percentile in Vocabulary and 50.2% scored above the 50th percentile in Comprehension. IN 2010, 44% OF COMBINED STUDENTS SCORED AT OR ABOVE THE 50TH PERCENTILE OF THE SAT 10 IN READING. 20% of African American students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading.53% of Caucasian students scored at or above the 50 percentile in Reading. In 2009, 44% of combined students scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Literacy. 15% of African American students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading and 28% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Language. 57% of Caucasian students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading and 55% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Language. 29% of the Free and Reduced Lunch students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading and 36% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Language. In 2008, 48.9% of combined students scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Literacy. In 2007, 46% of combined students scored at or above the 50th percentile on the ITBS Literacy. 17.7% of African American students scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading, 30% in language. 60% of Caucasian students scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading, 64% in language. 27% of Socio Economic Deprived students scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading, and 36% in language. 9% of Students with Disabilities students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: Vocabulary (select best synonym); Reading Comprehension (Analysis Generalization – identify speaker viewpoint), The lowest identified areas for the African Americans were: Reading Comprehension (vocabulary), The lowest identified areas for the Caucasians were: Reading Comprehension (vocabulary) (spelling), The lowest identified areas for the Socio Economic Deprived: Reading Comprehension, The lowest identified areas for the Students with Disabilities were: Reading Comprehension (vocabulary) (spelling). In 2010 the average ACT score in English was 19.8 and for Reading 19.6 and a 19.9 composite. For Caucasian students English was 22.0 and Reading was 21.3 and the composite was 21.6 The average ACT score for African American students in English was 15.7, Reading was 16.4 with a composite of 16.9. In 2009 the average ACT score in English was 21.1. The average composite score for Caucasians was 22.4 in English and 22.2 in Reading, while the average score for African-Americans was 16.2 in English and 15.8 in Reading. In 2008 the average ACT score in English was 20.5. The average composite score for Caucasians was 22.1 in English and 21.3 in Reading, while the average score for African-Americans was 17.4 in English and 16.7 in Reading. In 2007 the average ACT score in English was 21.0 in reading 20.3 The average

composite score for African-Americans was 17.0 in English and 16.7 in Reading. In 2006 the average ACT score in English was 19.5, in reading 19.7 while the average composite score for African American students was 17.8. In 2010-2011, 92% of the ALGEBRA AND 81% OF THE GEOMETRY STUDENTS SCORED PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED THUS MEETING STATUS. In 2011, 92% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 81% on EOC Geometry, 86% of African American students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 65% on EOC Geometry, 93% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 88% on EOC Geometry, 86% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 72% on EOC Geometry, N/A LEP students, 0.0% of Students with Disabilities scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 0.0% on EOC Geometry, The lowest identified areas of weakness for the combined populations were: Non-Linear Functions and Language of Algebra on Algebra open response questions, and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions and Triangles on Geometry open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Non-Linear Functions and Language of Algebra on Algebra open response, and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions and Triangles on Geometry open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for Caucasian students were: Language of Algebra on Algebra open response, and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions on Geometry open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for economically disadvantaged students were: Non-Linear Functions and Language of Algebra on Algebra and Relationship between 2 and 3 Dimensions and Triangles on Geometry open response questions. In 2010, 87% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 82% on EOC Geometry, 77% of African American students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 50% on EOC Geometry, 91% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 92% on EOC Geometry, 83% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 67% on EOC Geometry, N/A LEP students. The lowest identified areas of weakness for the combined populations were: Solve equations and inequalities of Algebra on open response questions, and Measurement in Geometry on open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Solving equations and inequalities in Algebra, and Measurement in Geometry on open response questions. In 2009, 84% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 70% on EOC Geometry, 67% of African American students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 50% on EOC Geometry, 89% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 78.0% on EOC Geometry, 73% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient on EOC Algebra and 56.0% on EOC Geometry, N/A LEP students, The lowest identified areas of weakness for the combined populations were: Non-Linear Functions of Algebra on open response questions, and Relationship of two and three dimensions for Geometry on open response questions; The lowest identified areas of weakness for African American students were: Non Linear Functions in Algebra, and Relationships between two and three dimensions in Geometry on open response questions. Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITBS): 2011 Math: 60.5% of all students scored above the 50th percentile in Concepts and Problem Solving while only 30% scored above the 50th percentile in Computation. In 2010, 80% of combined students in the 9th grade scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Mathematics. In 2009, 77.6% of combined students in the 9th grade scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Mathematics. In 2008, 72.5% of combined students in the 9th grade scored at or above the 50th percentile on the SAT 10 in Mathematics. The average ACT score in 10-11 for all students was 19.5 in Math, 18.8 in English, 19.2 in Reading and 19.3 Composite. 09-10 for all students in Math was 20.0; in 08-09, 21.1; and in 07-08, 20.1, over the same period of time. For African American students it was 16.9, 16.9, and 17.3. The percent of students meeting college readiness benchmark scores according to ACT in Mathematics in 2011 was 35%, 2010 was 33%, in 2009 was 42% in 2008 was 33%, in 2007 35%. For African American student for the same period it was 9%, 14%, 14%, and 20%. The Average Daily Attendance was as follows: 2007-2008 94.9%, 2008-2009 95.3%, 2009-2010 94.7% increased while remaining stable over the course of three years.

**Goal** To provide administrative leadership and support to Wynne School District building staff to enable students in meeting adequate yearly progress on state assessments in an effort to maintain AYP status associated with School Improvement.

**Benchmark** District Academic Leadership Team (ALT) shall focus on building administrators to provide leadership and support by helping principals to acquire the knowledge and resources necessary to increase student scores to the proficient and advanced levels on the state assessments in both literacy and mathematics to meet the Adequate Yearly Progress expected benchmarks.

Intervention: The Wynne School District Leaders will support buildings with educational components as needed to develop ACSIP.				
Scientific Based Research: Fullan, Michael. (2004). Leading In A Culture Of Change. San Francisco, CA: Whiley & Sons. Marzano, R. J., McNulty, B. A., Waters, T. (2005). School Leadership That Works: From Research To Results. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Maxwell John C. (2008). Leadership Gold: Lessons Learned from a Lifetime of Leading. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson. Reeves, Douglas B., (2006). The Learning Leader: How to Focus School Improvement for Better Results. Alexandria, VA: ASCD				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
3. District administrative staff will meet monthly in a District Joint Leadership Team to review and discuss curriculum, look at educational strategies and finance, analysis data, evaluate and refine current program implementation, and investigate future implementation through research. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Central Office</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
6. Wynne School District Superintendents will make weekly building and Classroom Walk-Throughs (CWT) to evaluate the	Carl Easley, Interim	Start: 08/19/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative</li> </ul>	

teaching and learning process taking place. Administrators will participate in a four day CWT training provided by Cooperative Specialists. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Superintendent	End: 05/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. Assistant Superintendents and Superintendent will monitor the performance of Principals and Assistant Principals to manage and drive productive change within the Wynne Public Schools. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
1. To assure the Wynne School District's campuses continue to evaluate and monitor AIPs/IRIs the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendents will support the staff by purchasing TLI AIP application subscriptions that are aligned with the Arkansas Curriculum Standards and review building AIP/IRIs in Academic Leadership Team Meetings. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. The Wynne School Board, Superintendents, and Administrative Staff will meet periodically in scheduled board retreats to discuss, review, and analyze the school district's academic performance to receive feedback and direction for school improvement. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. The Wynne School District Administrative Staff will provide 60 plus hours of professional development to building principals, teachers, and staff to enhance literacy and mathematics to support alignment and curriculum development in a continued effort to meet AYP. Professional development hours for staff will be record, monitored and evaluated through My Learning Plan. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
7. Wynne Superintendent and Asst. Superintendent will support recommendations of the District Joint Leadership Team made up of CREC STEM Center, Cooperative Specialists, and District Administrators to increase efforts to improve. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 10: The Wynne School District will encourage all parents to be partners in the education of their children.

Supporting Data:

1. Wynne School District participates in the Economic Impact of Arkansas Volunteers study by Arkansas Department of Human Services Annually. Wynne School District 2009-10 number of volunteers were 4,496 that gave a total of 25,442 hours with an estimated dollar value of \$414,544.00. Wynne School District 2008-09 number of volunteers were 3,494 that gave a total of 20,192 hours with an estimated dollar value of \$410,527.00. District report for 2007-08 number of volunteers were 798 that gave a total of 18,746 hours with an estimated dollar value of \$374,920.00. District report for 2006-07 number of volunteers were 448 that gave a total of 6,253 hours with an estimated dollar value of \$125,060.00
2. Parent Involvement Surveys results from 2009-2006 indicates that parents have a clear two-way communication: 2010-2011 92% of parents agreed, 2009-2010 73% of parents agreed, 2008-09 87% of parents agreed. The school provides information about school events, organizations, meetings, parenting tips, and activities: 2010-2011 83% of parents agreed, 2009-2010 50% of parents agreed, 2008-09 90% of parents agreed. Parent and community members are encouraged to volunteer during the year in the schools: 2010-2011 76% of parents agreed, 2009-2010 72% of parents, agreed, 2008-09 88% of parents agreed. I am aware the school district has a Parent Center with resources which parents may utilize: 2010-2011 99% of parents agreed, 2009-2010 83% of parents agreed, 2008-09 86% of parents agreed. Parent friendly environment I feel my opinions and concerns are welcomed and valued: 2010-2011 87% of parents agreed, 2009-2010 52% of parents agreed, 2008-09 86% of parents agreed.
3. Parent Conferences in the Wynne School District. The percentage of parents attending Parent/Teacher Conferences 2009-2006: 2008-09 at Wynne High School (WHS) 19.5%, 2007-08 WHS 13.8%, 2006-07 19.5%; Wynne Junior High School (WJH) 2008-09 59%, 2007-08 WJH 42.2%, 2006-07 WJH 53%; Wynne Intermediate School (WIS) 2008-09 68%, WIS 2007-08 74%, WIS 2006-07 71%, Wynne Primary School (WPS) 2008-09

84%, WPS 2007-08 84%, WPS 2006-2007 81%.

4. 1. In 2011 55% of parents activated ed-line accounts. In 2010 53% of parents activated their accounts. In 2009 52% of parents activated ed-line accounts. This is an increase from the start of ed-line in 2007 which was 48%.
5. After analyzing the parent survey data there are areas that need to be addressed in the Parental Engagement section of the 2011-2012 plan. Parental Communication continues to increase. The notable areas of concern are: Academic assistance with their student 31-46% of parents ask for help in areas of Literacy and 27-52% request help in Mathematics. 64% of parents did not receive parent workshops in 2010-11 overall survey data indicated the desire for additional parenting workshops to support the overall child.

**Goal** All parents of children in the Wynne School District shall play an integral role in the education of their children.

**Benchmark** The Wynne School District will continue setting expectation goals and promote parent participation of 80% of parents to be actively engaged in 2011-2012 parent conferences.

**Benchmark** 70% or more of parents will sign up for an edline e-mail notification account in 2011-2012.

Intervention: The Wynne School District will continue to meet with the Parent Advisory Committee, Special Education Parent Advisory Council, and the Parent Center Support Group on the four campuses.				
Scientific Based Research: Whitten, E., Esteves, K.J., Woodrow, A., RTI Success Proven Tools and Strategies for Schools and Classrooms (2009) Free Spirit Publishing, Inc.; Ladner, Joyce A.; Launching Our Black Children for Success: A Guide for Parents of Kinds from Three to Eighteen (2003) Jossey-Bass; Gurian, M. & Stevens, K., The Minds of Boys: Saving Our Sons from Falling Behind in School Life (2005) Jossey-Bass; Jones Rhonda, Turning Parents Into Volunteers (2009) Serenity Enterprises; Barkley, S. G., Tapping Student Effort, Increasing Student Achievement (2007). Cadiz, KY, Performance Systems, Inc.; Rosemond, J. Family Building: The 5 Fundamentals of Effective Parenting (2005). Kansas City, MO, McMeel Publishing.; Kimmons, W. J., A Parenting Guidebook: The Role of Schools, Family, Teachers, Community, Government in Assisting Parents with Rearing Their Children (2005). Bloomington, IN, AuthorHouse. Henderson, A. T., Mapp, K. L., Johnson, R. J., & Davies D., Beyond the Bake Sale: The Essential Guide to Family-School Partnerships (2007). New York, NY, The New Press.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
4. The Wynne School District will schedule three Parent-Teacher Conference Days for grades K-8 and four Parent-Teacher Conference Days for grades 9-12 to communicate with the parent the building level curriculum and standards, look at student assessments, review students AIP's/IRI's, and link with parents as a partner to assist parents in their child's academic progress. All students' parents, beginning with the sixth grade students, will attend a sixth grade orientation session to discuss opportunities and requirements for student achievement. Parents and students also attend a Smart Core/Core Curriculum in grade eight to develop career planning and goals. The district's expectation is to increase the parents attendance at parent teacher conferences over the next year and to provide better opportunities for parents to collaborate on students' educational future. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. The district will provide access and encourage parents to students' grades, attendance, and discipline records through parent/teacher conferences, quarterly student grade reports, and through web-based programs such as Edline and Sharp School. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Kathy Lee, Assistant Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. The district will support the yearly formation of building level PTA/PTSA on all four campuses to encourage parental involvement in order to network and meet different people, to form a collaborative association partnering with families and community who will actively engage with schools and families to support and increase childrens learning. The district working through PTA/PTSA will focus on diversity issues by promoting special leadership and seminars to provide training in cultural assimilation and other concerns. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	PTA Building President, Amy Hood; Parent Coordinator Sherry Breckenridge	Start: 09/08/2011 End: 05/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
6. A district parent volunteer application will be completed to sign parents up to work in the district volunteer program. A volunteer orientation training session will be held to welcome parents as volunteers for grades K-12 in October 2010. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
7. A district parent volunteer directory/parent resource book will be designed and distributed to each building. Campuses shall request volunteer assistance through the parental involvement program. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>8. There will be a parenting area at each campus in the Wynne School District as well as a district parent center to provide essential materials to assist parents in being educational partners. A parent facilitator who is a certified teacher will be contracted from district funds in support of parental involvement at each campus as required by Act 307 of 2007 and Act 397. A 1.0 FTE district/federal funded parent coordinator is contracted above the state requirement to coordinate the parental involvement program. (See student achievement priority for funding of parent coordinator position). Select training sessions will be held to train parent facilitators, parent coordinator, and building administrators in effective strategies to attract parents to the building parent area and the district parent center. Each of the four campus facilitators and district parent coordinator will assist parents in becoming an integral partner and provide a friendly atmosphere. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Kathy Lee, Federal Program Director</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>9. Prepare and distribute parent informational packets by September 20, 2011, to promote academic achievement that are grade appropriate for the students as described in Act 603 of 2003, Act 307 of 2007, and Act 397 of 2009 which includes the district commitment to parental involvement and all other requirements. 5) The process for resolving concerns of parents is in the student handbook. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Asst. Superintendent, and Carl Easley, Interim Superintendents; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator; Bui</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>10. The district will give technology training and support to post class grades, activities, and lesson plans, in the use of the district's and schools' web page, Edline, grade quick, and Sharp School. Teachers shall maintain grades and post communications in a responsible manner to the web link. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Kathy Lee, Assistant Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>11. In-order to provide instruction to parents on the incorporation of developmentally appropriate learning activities in the home environment the district will distribute parent newsletters, monthly calendars with learning activities, frog family fun packs and provide parent with skill practice packets for use in the home. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Federal Program Director; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator; Parent Facilitators</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>12. Parent Involvement Days and Evenings will be held on all four campuses to integrate parental involvement programs and activities in the academic cores of mathematics, literacy, science, and technology, such as, Line-up For Literacy and Mathematics, Parents Helping Students With High School Success, Literary Laughs, Author, Michael Shoulders Parent Seminar, and Fall Into Math and Literacy Night. Parent module training workshops will be scheduled to engage parents in their child's learning and to give parents strategies to help their child in the home environment. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Assistant Superintendent; Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>13. The district will support campuses in the development of program/seminars to engage parents in student decision making processes. Seminars will include parent/student transition information sessions, freshman orientation to introduce parent and students to high school life, ACT tip review, college planning night, financial aid workshop, and career choice evening. Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Kathy Lee; Assistant Superintendent; Keith Watson, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>1. The district collaborated to design and implement a School-Parent-Teacher-Student Compact that was developed with Title I staff, parent facilitators, TI parent coordinator, parents, teachers and administrators. The Title I compact will provide assistance to parents in understanding content, monitoring their child's progress, and including an outline of activities that the parents, school staff, and students will undertake to develop and build a partnership to help students achieve the state's high academic standards. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Kathy Lee, Assistant Superintendent; Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Title Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
<p>14. Two hours of parental involvement training will be provided for teachers as part of the stated required 60 hours of Professional Development. Three hours of parental involvement training will be provided for district and campuses administrators above the required 60 hours of Professional Development. Teachers, principals, staff, and administrators will be educated in the importance of effective parental communication and the value and use of contributions made by parents.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Kathy Lee, Federal Programs	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>15. Information related to school and parent programs are sent to parents via district website, flyers, radio announcements, channel 17, school messenger, marquee, and newspaper articles in an understandable language.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent; Kathy Lee, Asst. Sup't; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>16. The parents may request assistance, support, and materials for parental involvement activities through the district parent center under the direction of the district parent coordinator and campuses facilitators.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Kathy Lee, Federal Programs; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator; Parent Facilitators	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>3. The district advisory committee will work with the parental involvement plan and to review the district parental involvement plan, school parent compacts, and its commitment to parental involvement. In addition to the advisory committee the district facilitates community collaborations with business leaders and school alumni in its efforts to improve students' education and available resources.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Director; Sherry Breckenridge, Parent Coordinator	Start: 03/17/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>17. Annually the Wynne School District will make available to each building the opportunity for parent facilitators to attend the state and national parental involvement conferences along with the district parent coordinator, parents, and administrative staff. They shall return with ideas, resources, and data to improve the current parental involvement program. Appropriate collaboration and training will be provided to the staff of each building. Funds are provided within each building ACSIP plans for conference expense.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Kathy Lee, Federal Program Director	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>18. A data collection system will be investigated and designed so that consistent parent involvement information and data may be collected and connected to improved student achievement through tracking parental involvement in student education.</p> <p>Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Kathy Lee, Federal Programs Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
<p>19. Pursuant to Section 724C of the McKinney-Vento HOMELESS Assistance Act, as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the Wynne School District Administration works closely with students, parents, schools, shelters, and involves communities in support to ensure homeless students are identified and are offered a consistent educational experience during transitional time. The district has selected a HOMELESS LIAISON, Sherry Breckenridge, to ensure students in homeless situations are identified, enrolled, and assisted in receiving educational services, and have transportation to and from school at parent request. Students receives the same special programs and services as provided to other students, including GT, special education, migrant education, special activities, and vocational education. The homeless liaison works closely with the building parent facilitators, principals, teachers, RNs, and caseworker to identify, provide food, clothing, shelter, school supplies, academic and emotional support,</p>	Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

health screenings, and medical attention. Community Resources (DHS, Good Shepard Center, Wal-Mart, Arkansas Rice Depot, church groups and civic organizations, school staff, and medical groups partner with the district to identify and provide assistance to the homeless. Funds are set aside through district and Title I along with community financial support to assist the families experiencing homelessness, a crisis affecting every aspect of the students' lives. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide Action Type: Wellness				
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 11: The district will provide Alternative Learning Environment for students in grades K-12 that seeks to eliminate traditional barriers to student learning.

- Supporting Data:
- In the 2007-2008 school year 49 students in grades K-12 were placed in a alternative learning environment as compared to 70 in 2008-2009, and 47 in 2009-2010.
  - In 2007-2008, 32% of students placed in ALE returned to the general curriculum as compared to 40% in 2008-2009 and 63% in 2009-2010.
  - Over a two year period from 2008-2010, 16% of students placed in ALE received special education services with 64% of those student being African-American.

Goal: Students will successfully transition/re-enter the general curriculum learning environment from the alternative intervention program at each school campus.

Benchmark: In 2011-12 there will be a 5% increase in the in the number of students in grades K-12 who return to the general curriculum from a alternative placement.

Intervention: Implementation of PBSS, Career Counseling, Conflict resolution and CPI Crisis Prevention Intervention strategies in the alternative learning curriculum.				
Scientific Based Research: Horner, R., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Todd, A., Nakasato, J., & Esperanza, J., (in press). A Randomized Control Trial of School-wide Positive Behavior Support in Elementary Schools. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions. Bradshaw, C., Koth, C., Bevans, K., Ialongo, N., & Leaf, P. (in press). The impact of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) on the organizational health of elementary schools. School Psychology Quarterly. Filter, K. J., McKenna, M. K., Benedict, E. A., Horner, R. H., Todd, A. W., & Watson, J. (2007). Check in/ check out: A post-hoc evaluation of an efficient, secondary-level targeted intervention for reducing problem behaviors in schools. Education and Treatment of Children, 30(1), 69-84 Los Angeles County Office of Education October, 2003 This study was conducted by Glade D. Eggett, a doctoral candidate at Nova Southeastern University, working for the Division of Alternative Education of the Los Angeles Office of Education. Glade studied the effects of the WhyTry on the behavior of students in an alternative high school. The study consisted of a class of primarily African American and Latin American students, with a control group with the same demographics in the same school. Students were taught the WhyTry Program for two hours in each academic day for one term. Behavior was tracked weekly and compared to the control group. Granite School District September, 2003 A study was conducted by Spectrum Consulting for the Granite School District in Utah. Dr. Eric J. Gee, Director of Research and Evaluation, reported the results to the school district. Rather than studying behaviors, this study focused on students understanding and insight into their behaviors. Dr. Gee concluded that students participating in the WhyTry Program reported significantly improved understanding of key social and emotional principles, including self-motivation, consequences, peer pressure, and obeying laws and rules. "Analysis of the responses found statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups for all questions. This would suggest that students in the control group did indeed feel they had gained more knowledge regarding some of the information presented in the WhyTry Program. Given the control group comparisons, we can attribute this change in knowledge to the WhyTry Program," wrote Dr. Gee. McWhirter, E.H., Rasheed, S., & Crothers, M. (2000). The effects of high school career education on social-cognitive variables. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47(3), 330-335 Hay, I., Byrne, M., & Butler, C. (2000). Evaluation of a conflict-resolution and problem-solving program to enhance adolescents' self-concept. British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 28(1), 101-113.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
1. ALE staff both elementary and secondary will complete training in all strategies that will be included in the ALE curriculum to ensure the correct implementation of the programs as evidenced by sign-in sheets and administrative evaluation and classroom walk throughs. Action Type: Professional Development	Glenda Vance, Special Ed Supervisor	Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
4. Outside therapist, school counselors, and a career counselor will conduct small group counseling sessions with ALE students to address specific behavior problems, conflict resolution skills and job related skills. Action Type: Parental Engagement	Glenda Vance, Special Ed Director	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/01/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
3. Case managers, therapist, and the school social worker will meet regularly with ALE staff to discuss the needs of each student with whom they work. Logs will be kept by ALE staff documenting all meetings and conversation about students placed in ALE. Action Type: Collaboration	Jacky England, Olivia Burton, Callie	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/01/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$

	Jones, ALE supervising teachers			
7. ALE staff will keep detailed academic and behavioral records to be used by the intake committee members to make decisions on transitions back to the general curriculum. Placement meetings for re-entry will be schedule quarterly. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Jacky England, Olivia Burton, Callie Jones, ALT lead teachers	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/01/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
5. When students are recommended for a ALE placement an intake committee meeting is held. Students must exhibit at least two or more of the characteristics of: disruptive behavior, drop out from school, personal family problems, absenteeism, transition to or from residential programs. Other situations that negatively affect the student's academic and social progress are also considered. The committee reviews academic and behavioral records and a length of placement of not less than 21 days is made with a projected target date for exit from the program. Action Type: Collaboration	Building Level Principals	Start: 08/01/2011 End: 06/01/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
2. At each intake meeting an academic and behavior plan is developed for each student placed in the program. The academic program follows the same standards as the general curriculum with an emphasis on remediation of basic skills needed for Mathematics and Literacy. Students with IEPs and 504 plans continue to receive services as they relate to those plans. Instruction is also given to improve social skills with the use conflict resolution, positive behavior system strategies (Stop & Think). Action Type: Collaboration	Jacky England, Olivia Burton, Callie Jones, ALE Lead teachers	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/01/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
6. Prior to a students return to the general curriculum the ALE committee at each level meets to plan for transition and address any safety concerns related to behavior. Behavior support plans are reviewed and updated as needed prior to the students return. Counselors, assistant principals, and deans will monitor each student who is returned to the general curriculum. Action Type: Collaboration	Building Level Principals	Start: 08/19/2011 End: 06/01/2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 12: The Wynne School District shall work toward restructuring schools in years 5 and 7 of School Improvement.

- Supporting Data:
1. Wynne High School moved to TII-4 Targeted Intensive Improvement in Literacy as a result of of spring 2011 performances on the grade 11 EOC assessments due to the scores in the sub population: Caucasian. Number of Groups Met AYP: 7 of 8.
  2. The Wynne Intermediate School grades 3-5 and the Wynne Primary School grades K-2 moved to WSII-5R Whole School Instensive Improvement as a result of the spring 2011 Benchmark Exams for Students with Disabilities in math and African American and Students with Disabilities in Literacy. Number of Groups Met AYP: 7 of 10.
  3. Wynne Junior High School moved to SD-7 State Directed School Improvement as a result of the spring 2011 performance on the Benchmark Exam. The area of concern in math is African American and Students with a Disability and Combined, African American, Caucasian, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities for Literacy. Number of Groups Met AYP: 3 of 10.

Goal The four schools at the Wynne District will show sufficient gains on the 2010 state assessments to maintain current school improvement status.

Benchmark Wynne High School will maintain the current improvement performance in literacy on the 2011 EOC showing improvement for African American and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups.

Benchmark Wynne Intermediate and Wynne Primary will continue to show significant gains in math and literacy for Students with Disabilities in order to make Safe Harbor on the spring 2011 Benchmark.

Benchmark Wynne Junior School will increase math and literacy scores for Students with Disabilities on the spring 2011 Benchmark in order to make Safe Harbor to maintain status.

Intervention: The district will provide school support to WHS, WPS, WIS, and WJH in Corrective Action, Restructuring, and State-Directed Status. The district will provided shared leadership between the interm superintendent, assistant superintendent, building principals, and distributing leadership among teacher leaders on each campus.
Scientific Based Research: Dufour, R., Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work: New Insights for Improving Schools. Bloomington, IN, Soutlion Tree. Whitten, E., Esteves, K.J. & Woodrow, A. (2009). RTI Success: Proven Tools and Strategies for Schools and Classrooms. Minneapolis, MN, Free Spirit Publishing Inc. Reeves, D.B. (2004). Accountability For Learning: How Teachers and School Leaders Can Take Charge. Alexandria, VA, ASCD. Reeves, D.B. (2006). The Learning Leader: How To Focus School Improvement For Better Results. Alexandria, VA, ASCD. Marzano, R, Norford, J. Paynter, D. Pickering, D. Gaddy, B. (2001). A Handbook for Classroom Instruction That Works. Alaxandria, VA. ASCD.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>5. The Wynne Schools will secure the services of JBHM in 2010-2012 as consultants on the four school campuses with SIG1003a, NSLA, Title I, and ARRA funds to work directly with campuses in school improvement. The consultants will model best practices in the buildings as part of the Struggling Learner Program, RTI, and Coaching Models. The consultants will collect and analyze data, perform CWT's, meet with building principal, SI Team, monthly work reports, and provide leadership to district.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Professional Development                      Action Type: Program Evaluation                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>10. The Joint Leadership Team along with JBHM will review and analyze past performances of the four campuses in literacy and mathematics and will assist staff members in associating data patterns and targeting improvement points. They will communicate with the buildings math and literacy coaches, principals, superintendents, and data teams to totally analyze all available data such as interim assessments, Benchmark, EOC, NRT, and DIBELS data.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Professional Development                      Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>6. All four schools in CORRECTIVE ACTION, RESTRUCTURING, AND STATE DIRECTED math and literacy will work with the ADE appointed technical assistance team from the Crowley's Ridge Educational Cooperative. Assistance to the campuses will be provided from the team in PBSS, Data Analysis, CWT training, HIVE training, TIA, Differentiated Instruction, Marzano's HYS, Back Mapping Protocols, Program Alignment, and School Reform Strategies to effectively change school climate and academics. The team had it's first meeting on July 19, 2011. Evaluation of the assistance will be evident in the year through documentation of agendas, reports, data analyses, and professional development training surveys.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Professional Development                      Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>1. The Wynne Public School District has 2 campuses in WHOLE SCHOOL INTENSIVE IMPROVEMENT (WSII-5-R): Wynne Primary K-2 and Wynne Intermediate School GR 3-5 (Math SI-5 and Literacy SI-6). In order to assist Wynne Primary and Wynne Intermediate Restructuring Schools for 2011-2012 the district The focus will be placed in literacy and math on the subgroups African American and Students with Disabilities. Assistant Superintendent, Kathy Lee, will facilitate quarterly joint leadership team meetings with teams from Wynne Primary School and Wynne Intermediate School. The joint leadership team will analyze data from Classroom Walk-Through (CWT), and other formative and summative assessments. The team will monitor student progress and instructional practices throughout the year.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Professional Development                      Action Type: Program Evaluation                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>8. Special Education Supervisor, Glenda Vance, will attend the Joint Leadership Team meetings to review progress of special education students and discuss effective instructional strategies. Training will be provided for special education teachers regarding behavioral management, effective instructional practices, and portfolio assessment.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>9. The internal organization of the school will be restructured into six learning pods. Teacher leaders will be assigned to oversee each cluster of four to six classrooms. The pod leaders will visit classrooms to observe struggling learners and their interaction with the classroom environment. They will assist teachers in developing effective interventions and monitoring the</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011                      End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>progress of these students. Pod leaders will monitor student formative data and assist building administrators with corrective actions.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>2. The Wynne High School GR 9-12 is in TARGETED INTENSIVE IMPROVEMENT (TII -4) School Improvement (Literacy Status: SI-5 &amp; Math Status: MS). In 2011-2012 WHS will use JBHM Response to Intervention (RTI -Debra Bowers) to help analyze school leadership, CWT's, provide guidance, professional development, build infrastructure, and technical assistance. JBHM will report to superintendent after each campus visit. The WHS will implement professional learning communities and use campus literacy coach to help analyze data, develop and implement timely interventions for students, work with teachers to use high-yield strategies, continue Literacy Lab, and determine necessary elements in literacy. The campus will extend learning time for students on topics and skills that lack sufficient progress in literacy in a daily created learning activity period. The district will monitor progress on these actions using the literacy coach, assistant superintendent, and interm superintendent at on-site visits, maintaining a data wall, and requiring monthly updates from the principal and academic coaches.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 08/10/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>7. The Superintendent and Asst. Superintendent will focus attention on monitoring the performance of principals in CORRECTIVE ACTION, RESTRUCTURING, and STATE DIRECTED schools to determine their effectiveness in leading change that will impact student performance in turning around the campuses' academic progress.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>4. The Wynne School District has one campus the Wynne Junior High School in STATE-DIRECTED (SD-7) Math Status: SI-7 and Literacy Status: SI-8. The Superintendent and Asst. Superintendent will focus attention on the performance of the Wynne Junior High Principals in (SD-7) to determine their effectiveness of leading change that will turn student performance around. The district administrators shall utilize the findings from the 2007 Scholastic Audit to guide this change based upon the audit recommendations. WJHS will continue its daily 95 minutes of math and literacy classes for all students. Leon Brown will facilitate a technology review in CWT's and make recommendations for change. James Lee, Tammy Winslow and Beckie Naylor will provide and facilitate the use of HIVE analysis at PLC.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>3. Wynne Schools' Joint Leadership Team will review and analyze past performances of the four campuses presented by the math and literacy coaches. The team will assist the principals in analyzing data and patterns to target specific areas needing improvement. Afterwards the team shall communicate with the building staff to share findings and implement such actions as needed to enhance restructuring.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Carl Easley, Interim Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2011 End: 06/30/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$0</p>

• Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
	Jeff Stuart	Detective WPD	Federal Programs
Business Representative	Anita Fisher	Bank Representative	Advisory

Business Representative	Chaun Pulley	Cross County Bank	Federal Programs
Business Representative	Jay Caldwell	Parent/Alumni/APEX	Parent Advisory Alumni
Business Representative	Odell McCallum	First National Bank	SES
Business Representative	Stacie Patterson	Cross Ridge Hospital Pharmacy	Parent Advisory Alumni
Classroom Teacher	Amy Poindexter	TI Math Focus Teacher K-2	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Annette Hall	Kindergarten - Teacher	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Barbara Trevino	Special Education	Title I
Classroom Teacher	Carla Benson	TI Reading Recovery Teacher GR1 -2	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Cindy Harris	Math Coach	
Classroom Teacher	Donna Snyder	Fourth Grade Teacher	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Kellye Ramsey	Title I Math GR 3-5	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Lori Cothorn	English Teacher / Parent Facilitator GR 6-8	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Lynn Gardner	Math Team Chair GR 3	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Milena Hylle	Second Grade Teacher	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Natalie Lancaster	HS English	Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Robin Bethell	Math Instructor	School Supplies
Classroom Teacher	Shirley Hale	TI Reading Focus Teacher	Advisory
Classroom Teacher	Wendy Stafford	Special Education	SES
Classroom Teacher	Yvonna Stovall	TI Reading GR 3-5	Advisory
Community Representative	Brian Thompson	Chamber of Commerce	Title I Parent Involvement
Community Representative	Bridgette Hart	Community	School Supplies
Community Representative	Fredrick Smith	Alumni/McCallum Center	Advisory Alumni
Community Representative	George Ann Draper	Community Volunteer	Advisory
Community Representative	Jennifer Lynch	Parent Involvement	Title I
Community Representative	Kitty Bingham	Cross County Health Department	Advisory
Community Representative	Michael Smith	Detective WPD	SES
Community Representative	Stephanie Emerson	Parent Facilitator	Title I Pac
District-Level Professional	Carl Easley	Interim Superintendent	Advisory
District-Level Professional	Glenda Vance	Special Ed. Supervisor GR K-12	Advisory
District-Level Professional	Kathy Lee	Assistant Superintendent / Federal Programs Supervisor	Advisory
District-Level Professional	Sandra Smith	Asst. Principal GR 9-12	Advisory
District-Level Professional	Sherry Breckenridge	Parent Coordinator K-12	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Betty Latham	Literacy Coach GR 4-5, Title I	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Blake Marsh	Asst. Principal GR 6-8	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Brenda Martin	Counselor K-2	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Bundy Hickey	Literacy Coach GR 6-12	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Callie Jones	Oasis Teacher / Parent Facilitator	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Connie Mitchell	Mathematics Coach 3-5	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Gayla Holbrook	Literacy Coach GR 1	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jeannine Brawner	Title I Math GR 1-2	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Kaylee Boeckmann	Media Specialist GR 3-5	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Laura Fowler	Counselor 6 - 8	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Melinda Haines	Title I Secretary	Parent Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Nancy Dunaway	Parent Facilitator GR K-2	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Pam Gaskin	Counselor 3 - 5	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Ree Routon	Media Specialist GR 9-12	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sharon Sisk	Mathematics Coach GR 6-8	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Shirley Taylor	Literacy Coach GR 3, Reading 1st	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Stephanie Lyons	Asst. Principal GR 3-5	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Tammie Warren	Librarian GR 6-8	Advisory
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Tonya Brown	TI Secretary	Advisory
Parent	Amy Hood	Parent	PTA President
Parent	Beula Battles	Grandmother	Federal Programs
Parent	Kenneth Pickett	Grandfather	School Supplies

Parent	Keri House	March of Dimes Coordinator	Parent Advisory
Parent	Kim Thornhill	Alumni / PTSA Member GR 6-8	Parent Advisory Alumni
Parent	Kristin Winn	PTSA	Title I Parent Involement
Parent	Lane Goodwin	Parent/Alumni/KWYN Radio	Advisory Alumni
Parent	Leigh Trail	Parent Student of WHS	Parent Advisory
Parent	Lori Hunt	Parent	Parent Advisory
Parent	Lori Wilson	parent	School Supplies
Parent	Treshna Stephens	parent	Needs Assessment
Principal	Cindy Kinard	Assistant Principal K - 2	Advisory
Principal	David Stepp	Principal 6 - 8	Advisory
Principal	Debra Heath	Principal K - 2	Advisory
Principal	Keith Watson	Principal 9 - 12	Advisory
Principal	Sandra Hollaway	Principal 3 - 5	Advisory