

School Plan

BENTONVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT
400 NW 2nd Street, Bentonville, AR 72712

Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2008-2009

Bentonville Public Schools strives to prepare students in literacy, math and technology to achieve high academic standards today needed to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Grade Span: Title I: Not Applicable School Improvement:

Table of Contents

Priority 1: Academic Achievement

Goal: To continue to improve the academic achievement for all students in literacy and math with a specific focus in critical sub-population categories of free and reduced lunch, special education and limited English proficient students.

Priority 2: Safe School Environment

Goal: All schools in the Bentonville Public School District will maintain a safe and drug free environment.

Priority 3: Wellness

Goal: Bentonville Public Schools will provide support for staff and students in making healthy lifestyle choices by increasing staff participation in the district provided health screenings as well as decreasing the number of at-risk for or overweight students.

Priority 1: Academic achievement for all students.

Supporting
Data:

1. GRADE 4 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 960 students were tested and 80.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 89 students were tested and 31.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 65 students were tested and 46.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content—Open Response and Practical—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY

DISADVANTAGED (SES): 277 students were tested and 64.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 679 students were tested and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 22 students were tested and 68.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 96 students were tested and 64.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. GRADE 4 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 912 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 91 students were tested and 27% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 37 students were tested and 35% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 216 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response and Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 777 students were tested and 76% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 25 students were tested and 72% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that

- the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 69 students were tested and 53% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. GRADE 4 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 820 students were tested and 74.9% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 80 students were tested and 29.1% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response and Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 38 students were tested and 44.4% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response and Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 242 students were tested and 54.5% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response and Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 690 students were tested and 76.8% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 12 students were tested and 50.5% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response and Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 82 students were tested and 63.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Content-Open Response and Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style.
2. GRADE 4 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 960 students were tested and 86.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 89 students were tested and 41.0%

scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 65 students were tested and 68.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurements. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 277 students were tested and 75.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. CAUCASIAN: 779 students were tested and 89.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 22 students were tested and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. HISPANIC: 96 students were tested and 76.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. GRADE 4 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 912 students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 91 students were tested and 39% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Geometry. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 37 students were tested and 54% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 216 students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest

identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. CAUCASIAN: 777 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 25 students were tested and 72% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. HISPANIC: 69 students were tested and 59% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. GRADE 4 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 820 students were tested and 71.8% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 80 students were tested and 32.9% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement, Geometry, and Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Measurements. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 38 students were tested and 55.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurements. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 242 students were tested and 53.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurements. CAUCASIAN: 690 students were tested and 73.5% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 12 students were tested and 37.5% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements, Geometry, and Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. HISPANIC: 82

students were tested and 61.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements.

3. **GRADE 6 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION:** 900 students were tested and 79.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP):** 66 students were tested and 20.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP):** 47 students were tested and 41.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES):** 258 students were tested and 63.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **CAUCASIAN:** 731 students were tested and 82.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **AFRICAN-AMERICAN:** 24 students were tested and 79.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **HISPANIC:** 101 students were tested and 65.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **GRADE 6 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION:** 865 students were tested and 73% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. **STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP):** 81 students were tested and 12% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response.

The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 41 students were tested and 42% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 224 students were tested and 59% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 717 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 25 students were tested and 64% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 75 students were tested and 62% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response and Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. GRADE 6 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 754 students were tested and 79.3% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 63 students were tested and 19.7% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) was Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 26 students were tested and 27.8% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 198 students were tested and 57.7% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response and Content-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 661 students were tested and 81.4% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-

choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response and Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: There was no significant number of African-American students tested to report assessment data. HISPANIC: 63 students were tested and 56.6% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response and Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style.

4. GRADE 6 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 900 students were tested and 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 66 students were tested and 55.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 47 students were tested and 42.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 258 students were tested and 70.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. CAUCASIAN: 731 students were tested and 87.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 24 students were tested and 83.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. HISPANIC: 101 students were tested and 71.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. GRADE 6 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 865 students were

tested and 83% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra, Geometry, and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry, Measurements, and Data Analysis and Probability. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 81 students were tested and 45% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 41 students were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. The lowest identified areas (s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 224 students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. CAUCASIAN: 717 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra, Geometry, and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas (s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements, Geometry, and Data Analysis and Probability. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 25 students were tested and 64% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. HISPANIC: 85 students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Analysis and Probability. GRADE 6 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 754 students were tested and 78.5% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurements. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 63 students were tested and 22.7% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 26 students were tested and 27.8% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the

analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 198 students were tested and 60.1% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations, Algebra, and Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurements. CAUCASIAN: 661 students were tested and 80.5% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra and Measurements. AFRICAN AMERICAN: There was no significant number of African American students tested to report assessment data. HISPANIC: 63 students were tested and 56.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements.

5. GRADE 8 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 808 students were tested and 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Open Response and Writing—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 61 students were tested and 22.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Open Response and Practical—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 33 students were tested and 36.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 205 students were tested and 65.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Open Response and Content—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 686 students were tested and 87.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Open Response and Writing—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 17 students were tested and 76.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and

multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Multiple Choice, Practical—Open Response and Writing—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 83 students were tested and 65.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Open Response and Content—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. GRADE 8 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 804 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response and Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 69 students were tested and 20% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 33 students were tested and 39% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 179 students were tested and 64% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response, Content-Open Response and Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 674 students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 16 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 81 students were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response and Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. GRADE 8 LITERACY BENCHMARK EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 723 students were tested and 84.4% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified

area(s) were Writing—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 71 students were tested and 40.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Writing-Multiple Choice and Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 19 students were tested and 23.5% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Writing-Multiple Choice, Content-Open Response, and Content-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 176 students were tested and 70.9% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Writing-Multiple Choice and Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 618 students were tested and 86.2% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 14 students were tested and 78.6% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 54 students were tested and 63.5% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Writing-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style.

6. GRADE 8 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 808 students were tested and 84.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 61 students were tested and 21.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 33 students were tested and 42.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice

questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 205 students were tested and 65.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. CAUCASIAN: 686 students were tested and 85.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 17 students were tested and 88.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements and Data Analysis and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Number and Operations. HISPANIC: 83 students were tested and 70.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Geometry. GRADE 8 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 804 students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 69 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Numbers and Operations and Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 33 students were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 179 students were tested and 64% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. CAUCASIAN: 674 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 16 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five

mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. HISPANIC: 81 students were tested and 65% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. GRADE 8 MATHEMATICS BENCHMARK EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 723 students were tested and 75.3% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 71 students were tested and 20.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Measurements. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 19 students were tested and 5.9% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 176 students were tested and 57.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. CAUCASIAN: 618 students were tested and 77.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 14 students were tested and 57.1% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra. HISPANIC: 46 students were tested and 50.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Geometry and Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Algebra.

7. GRADE 11 LITERACY EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 710 students were tested and 74.9% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Open Response and Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 76 students were tested and 26.3% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-

choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response and Content—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 25 students were tested and 20.0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 144 students were tested and 53.5% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 604 students were tested and 78.5% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Open Response and Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 11 students were tested and 72.7% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary—Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 65 students were tested and 49.2% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content—Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. GRADE 11 LITERACY EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 714 students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 66 students were tested and 14% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 23 students were tested and 9% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 133 students were tested and 41% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s)

were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 607 students were tested and 77% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: 18 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. HISPANIC: 63 students were tested and 32% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Practical-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. GRADE 11 LITERACY EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 561 students were tested and 69.7% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response and Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 57 students were tested and 11% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response and Content-Multiple Choice. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 11 students were tested and 9% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Multiple Choice and Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 82 students were tested and 41.6% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. CAUCASIAN: 474 students were tested and 73.3% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Literary-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style. AFRICAN-AMERICAN: There was no significant number of African-American students tested to report assessment data. HISPANIC: 54 students were tested and 52.7% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content-Open Response. The analysis of the open response questions in the five writing domains revealed that the lowest identified area(s) were Content and Style.

8. EOC ALGEBRA EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 594 students were tested and 87.7% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the

analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities and Linear Functions. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 46 students were tested and 58.7% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities, Linear Functions and Non-Linear Functions. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Data Interpretation and Probability. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 31 students were tested and 54.8% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Solving Equations and Inequalities. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 146 students were tested and 78.8% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Solving Equations and Inequalities. CAUCASIAN: 493 students were tested and 90.3% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities and Linear Functions. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 10 students were tested and 80.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities and Linear Functions. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra. HISPANIC: 69 students were tested and 75.4% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Solving Equations and Inequalities. EOC ALGEBRA EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 888 students were tested and 86% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Interpretation and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Non-Linear Functions. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 74 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Data Interpretation and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT

(LEP): 37 students were tested and 38% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Non-Linear Functions and Data Interpretation and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 186 students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Interpretation and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra. CAUCASIAN: 740 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Interpretation and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Non-Linear Functions. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 18 students were tested and 72% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Data Interpretation and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Algebra and Non-Linear Functions. HISPANIC: 87 students were tested and 60% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Non-Linear Functions and Data Interpretation and Probability. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equations and Inequalities. EOC ALGEBRA EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 640 students were tested and 86.7% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equation and Inequalities and Language of Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Linear Functions. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 68 students were tested and 34.3% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equation and Inequalities and Language of Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Non-Linear Functions. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): There was no significant number of Limited English Proficient students tested to report assessment data. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 139 students were tested and 72.3% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equation and Inequalities and Language of Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Non-Linear Functions. CAUCASIAN: 540 students were tested and 89.2% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equation and Inequalities and Language of Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five

mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Linear Functions. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 19 students were tested and 69.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equation and Inequalities and Language of Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Linear Functions. HISPANIC: 49 students were tested and 61.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Solving Equation and Inequalities and Language of Algebra. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Non-Linear Functions.

9. EOC GEOMETRY EXAM—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 814 students were tested and 90.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Coordinate Geometry and Transformations and Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Geometry and Measurements. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 50 students were tested and 74.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Coordinate Geometry and Transformations and Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 28 students were tested and 57.1% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 179 students were tested and 82.1% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Coordinate Geometry and Transformations and Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. CAUCASIAN: 680 students were tested and 92.9% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Coordinate Geometry and Transformations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Language of Geometry and Measurements. AFRICAN AMERICAN: 15 students were tested and 73.3% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. HISPANIC: 78 students were tested and 76.9% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Coordinate Geometry and Transformations and Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Measurements. EOC GEOMETRY EXAM—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 607 students were tested and 88%

scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 23 students were tested and 57% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles and Relationships Between Two- and Three-Dimensions.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): 22 students were tested and 54% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles and Measurement.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 100 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles.

CAUCASIAN: 514 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles and Measurement.

AFRICAN AMERICAN: 13 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas (s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles and Measurement.

HISPANIC: 45 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles.

EOC GEOMETRY EXAM—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 589 students were tested and 88.2% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles, Measurements, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): 23 students were tested and 69.0% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Measurement. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP): There was no significant number of Limited English Proficient students tested to report assessment data.

ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): 69 students were tested and 79.7% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles, Measurements, and Coordinate Geometry and

Transformations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. CAUCASIAN: 523 students were tested and 89.6% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles, Measurements, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles. AFRICAN AMERICAN: There was no significant number of African-American students tested to report assessment data. HISPANIC: 41 students were tested and 71.1% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area(s) in the analysis of the open response questions in the five mathematics strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles, Measurements, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformations. The lowest identified areas(s) in the analysis of the multiple choice questions in the five mathematic strands revealed weaknesses in Triangles.

10. GRADE 2 –LITERACY—SAT10—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 1,036 students were tested and 56.8% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension. GRADE 2 –LITERACY—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 942 students were tested and 76.0% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary. GRADE 2 –LITERACY—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 857 students were tested and 77.6% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary.
11. GRADE 2 – MATHEMATICS—SAT10—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 1,036 students were tested and 69.7% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Math Problem Solving. GRADE 2 – MATHEMATICS—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 941 students were tested and 74.6% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Concepts and Problem Solving. GRADE 2 – MATHEMATICS—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 856 students were tested and 76.08% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Concepts and Problem Solving.
12. GRADE 5 – LITERACY—SAT10—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 943 students were tested and 77.2% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension. GRADE 5 – LITERACY—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 859 students were tested and 74.3% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary. GRADE 5 – LITERACY—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 777 students were tested and 77.12% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension.
13. GRADE 5 – MATHEMATICS—SAT10—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 943 students were tested and 75.7% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Math Problem Solving. GRADE 5 – MATHEMATICS—IOWA

TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 860 students were tested and 75.9% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Math Computation. GRADE 5 – MATHEMATICS—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 777 students were tested and 80.31% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Concepts and Estimations and Problem Solving and Data Analysis.

14. GRADE 7 – LITERACY—SAT10—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 884 students were tested and 75.4% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Reading Comprehension. GRADE 7 – LITERACY—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 775 students were tested and 74.0% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary. GRADE 7 – LITERACY—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 764 students were tested and 71.20% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the language subtests revealed weaknesses in Vocabulary.
15. GRADE 7 – MATHEMATICS—SAT10—2008: COMBINED POPULATION: 884 students were tested and 81.4% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Math Problem Solving. GRADE 7 – MATHEMATICS—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2007: COMBINED POPULATION: 774 students were tested and 79.1% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Math Computation. GRADE 7 – MATHEMATICS—IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS)—2006: COMBINED POPULATION: 763 students were tested and 78.51% had an NPR score of 50 or above. The analysis of the mathematics concepts and math Problem Solving subtests revealed weaknesses in Math Computation

Goal To continue to improve the academic achievement for all students in literacy and math with a specific focus in critical sub-population categories of free and reduced lunch, special education and limited English proficient students.

Benchmark To meet or exceed the AYP standard developed by the Arkansas Department of Education. Each schools' individual ACSIP plan reflects AYP grade level appropriate growth rate for the 2009 Augmented Benchmark Assessment.

Intervention: The district will provide support to students involved in programs related to Title I, English Second Language, Homeless, and Special Services in an effort to meet the individual academic needs of all students.				
Scientific Based Research: "Getting Started: Reculturing Schools to Become Professional Learning Communities", Eaker, R., DuFour, R., and DuFour, R., SolutionTree, (2002), "Closing the Achievement Gap: A Vision for Changing Beliefs and Practices", Williams, B., ASCD, (2003). "Classroom Instruction That Works for English Language Learners", Flynn, K. and Hill, J., ASCD, (2006). "Results Now: How We Can Achieve Unprecedented Improvements in Teaching and Learning", Schmoker, M., ACSD, (2006).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

<p>Title III funds will be used to purchase 160 seat licenses of Rosetta Stone software, 2 LCD projectors (\$815 each) and related installation expenses. These licenses and equipment will be used solely for providing supplemental instruction to identified ESL students. The Rosetta Stone program complements classroom teaching expertise, allowing teachers the opportunity to optimize learning time, enabling students to progress to fluency at a much faster pace.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	<p>Title III - Purchased Services: \$10000.00 Title III - Materials & Supplies: \$3900.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$13900</p>
<p>State English Language Learners (ELL) funds will be used to hire a 1.0 FTE highly qualified, certified ESL Specialist and a 1.0 FTE ESL Program Interpreter/Translator to be located at the ESL Center. All parents will complete a Home Language Survey. Students who qualify for ESL services will not be denied access to the programs because of a language barrier.</p> <p>Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • Performance Assessments 	<p>ELL (State-276) - Employee Benefits: \$24500.00 ELL (State-276) - Employee Salaries: \$104809.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$129309</p>
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title III funds will be used to hire a 1.0 FTE ESL</p>	<p>Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	<p>Title III - Materials & Supplies: \$2000.00 Title III - Employee Salaries: \$21165.00</p>

<p>Parent Coordinator to inform parents of the language level of their children and the types of programs that are available. Parental permission will be sought for the type of programming that is available for their child/children. Parents will also be informed of their right to refuse services. Title III funds will also be used to implement a parent outreach program that includes a Parent Night, Parent Advisory Committee, and ESL website development. These programs will be developed and implemented with a focus on informing parents how they can help their children attain English proficiency, achieve a high level in core academic subjects, and meet challenging State academic standards. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>				<p>Title III - Employee Benefits: \$4563.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$27728</p>
<p>State English Language Learners (ELL) funds will be used to pay for substitutes necessary for ESL students to be assessed using the state adopted English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) to determine each students' language level and appropriate services. All identified ESL students</p>	<p>Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>ELL (State-276) - Employee Benefits: \$827.00</p> <p>ELL (State-276) - Employee Salaries: \$3800.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$4627</p>

<p>currently classified as Served or Not-Directly-Served will participate in the ELDA assessment. Action Type: Equity</p>				
<p>Title I funds will be used to support program operating expenses including telephone, postage and copier expenses, as well as appropriate materials and supplies.</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$1500.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$3500.79</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$5000.79</p>
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT BUILDINGS: Title I funds will be used to hire a 0.8 FTE certified Federal Program Coordinator to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the District's Title I program.</p>	<p>Gary Compton, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$70331.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$16671.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$87002</p>
<p>Title I funds will be used to support district and building administrators, as well as teachers of Title I students, registration fees, travel, and hotel accommodations related to attendance at state, regional, and national conferences/workshops that will support teaching strategies, knowledge of programs, and instructional learning. No staff development hours will be awarded toward the state mandated 60 hours of professional development. Action Type:</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$3425.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$3425</p>

<p>Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>Title I funds will be used to hire a 0.6 FTE classified Federal Programs Assistant/Bookkeeper to ensure accurate records and expenditure of Title I funds.</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$20478.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$4371.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$24849</p>
<p>Title I funds will be allocated to provide certain basic necessities such as shelter, medical and guidance services, clothing, etc. for homeless students attending Bentonville schools. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Teachers 	<p>Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$4000.00 Title I - Purchased Services: \$2500.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$6500</p>
<p>Title I funds will be used to pay for travel expenses for teachers of at-risk students to attend training related to dropout prevention and helping at-risk students transition back into the regular classroom setting. Funds will also be used to purchase supplemental materials and supplies that support instruction provided to residential students at the Northwest Arkansas Children's Shelter and the YouthBridge Emergency Shelter. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Teachers • Teaching Aids • Title Teachers 	<p>Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$6030.00 Title I - Purchased Services: \$6820.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$12850</p>

<p>Title I Parental Engagement Set Aside funds have been allocated for each Title I school in the amount of \$1,300. Each school plan reflects the use of these funds for substitutes, travel expenses, salary/benefits, supplies, materials, and purchased services to supplement parental engagement activities above state requirements. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$3339.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$4356.00 Title I - Employee Salaries: \$1178.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$261.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$9134</p>
<p>Title I Professional Development Set Aside funds have been allocated to each Title I school in the amount of \$6,485. Individual school plans reflect professional development in the areas of literacy and math to be supported with these funds. These professional development activities will not count toward the state mandated 60 hours of professional development. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$43443.00 Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$1575.00 Title I - Employee Salaries: \$456.00 Title I - Employee Benefits: \$101.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$45575</p>

<p>HelpMe2Learn software is being utilized in all elementary computer training labs to facilitate instruction to ESL students in an effort to increase academic achievement. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title III funds and State English Language Learner (ELL) funds will be used to purchase instructional supplies and materials to support ESL programs in each building and the ESL Center. Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>Title III - Materials & \$31662.62 Supplies: ELL (State-276) - \$5000.00 Materials & Supplies: <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$36662.62</p>
<p>IDEA funds will be used to hire a 1.0 FTE highly qualified, certified Special Education Assistant Director, 2.0 FTE Special Education Medicaid/Due Process Clerks, a 1.0 FTE Special Education Bookkeeper, a 1.0 FTE Special Education Administrative Assistant, and a 0.5 FTE Special Education Secretary on each campus (8.0 FTE total) to facilitate appropriate conferences and necessary administrative services for identified IDEA students. IDEA funds will also be used to provide the appropriate</p>	<p>Lynn Runnels, Director of Special Education</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff 	<p>Special Ed. IDEA: \$503640.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$503640</p>

materials and supplies for program operations. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education				
IDEA funds will be used to contract with outside consultants for physical therapy and occupational therapy, including hippotherapy, for identified students in order for these students to benefit from their special education services. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Lynn Runnels, Director of Special Education	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Outside Consultants 	Special Ed. IDEA: \$310500.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$310500
IDEA funds will be used to contract with outside consultants for psychological evaluations necessary to identify IDEA students and their individualized needs. IDEA funds will also be used to purchase appropriate supplies and materials to support these psychological evaluations. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Lynn Runnels, Director of Special Education	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teaching Aids 	Special Ed. IDEA: \$60000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$60000
IDEA funds will be used to contract instruction for special needs students who must be educated in a home environment due to medical needs. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental	Lynn Runnels, Director of Special Education	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	Special Ed. IDEA: \$43500.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$43500

<p>Engagement Action Type: Special Education</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: IDEA funds will be used to contract professional services for identified students to continue their educational program during summer break in an effort for these special needs students to avoid educational regression during extended breaks from the school calendar. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Lynn Runnels, Director of Special Education</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>Special Ed. IDEA: \$25000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$25000</p>
<p>IDEA funds will be used to contract therapy day treatment for identified students with emotional issues in a therapeutic setting. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Waynette Chambers, Assistant Director of Special Education</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	<p>Special Ed. IDEA: \$67500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$67500</p>
<p>IDEA funds will be used to contract with outside consultants for advisement to the district related to the identification of vision and/or hearing impaired students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	<p>Waynette Chambers, Assistant Director of Special Education</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	<p>Special Ed. IDEA: \$98800.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$98800</p>

IDEA funds will be used to support operation and maintenance expenses for special education administration staff throughout the district. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education	Lynn Runnels, Director of Special Education	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	Special Ed. IDEA: \$40000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$40000
Title III funds will be used pay for substitutes, registration and travel expenses for the ESL Specialist and teachers to attend state and regional workshops/trainings and student field trips that will support teaching strategies, knowledge of programs, and instructional learning. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	Title III - Purchased Services: \$4700.00 Title III - Employee Salaries: \$100.00 Title III - Employee Benefits: \$23.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$4823
Title III funds will be used to support program operating expenses including mileage for translation services, telephone, postage and copier expenses. Action Type: Equity	Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	Title III - Purchased Services: \$3375.67 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$3375.67
Title III funds will be used to pay registration fees for eight teachers to participate in the ESL Academy. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	Title III - Purchased Services: \$32000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$32000
The district ESL Specialist will conduct an annual data comparison of ELDA	Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>results, Benchmark/SAT10 results, and quarterly formative assessment results for all Served and Not-Directly-Served ESL students to determine whether currently implemented instructional strategies and program interventions are yielding an increase in the language development and academic achievement for ELL students. The Language Placement and Assessment Committee (LPAC) will review and consider all assessment data for each student when developing/modifying each student's individual plan. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Assessments 	
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title III funds will be used to implement English In A Flash computerized language program in all elementary schools. ESL students in grades K-2 whose language level is at Level 1 or Level 2 will be targeted for use of this software. Funds will be used to purchase 125 English In a Flash software seat licenses. The English In A Flash program uses intense vocabulary development targeted mainly at low-level</p>	<p>Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computers • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>Title III - Purchased Services: \$3500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$3500</p>

<p>English speaking elementary students to help increase their use and knowledge of the English language. This program provides immediate feedback to students as well as teacher and parent reports necessary to evaluate student gains and effectiveness of the program. All elementary ESL teachers have been trained on the effective implementation and use of this software. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>Title I funds will be used to support the Federal Coordinator's registration fees, travel, and hotel accommodations to state, regional, and national conferences/workshops that will support teaching strategies, knowledge of programs, and instructional learning. No staff development hours will be awarded toward the state mandated 60 hours of professional development. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Outside Consultants 	<p>Title I - Purchased Services: \$5000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$5000</p>
<p>State English Language Learner funds will be used pay for substitutes, professional texts, registration and travel expenses for the ESL</p>	<p>Linda Koppenhaver, ESL Specialist</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	<p>ELL (State-276) - Purchased Services: \$49956.00</p>

<p>Specialist and teachers to attend state and regional workshops/trainings focused on addressing the writing weakness of our ESL students, implementing an ESL professional learning community, and providing professional development that enhances teacher skills in incorporating classroom instructional strategies that work best with ELL students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<p>ELL (State-276) - Materials & Supplies: \$7000.00 ELL (State-276) - Employee Benefits: \$1647.00 ELL (State-276) - Employee Salaries: \$7600.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$66203</p>
<p>The district special services department will conduct an annual data comparison of benchmark and alternative portfolio results for all identified special education students to determine whether currently implemented instructional strategies and program interventions are yielding an increase in the academic deficits for special education students. The IEP team will review and consider all assessment data for each student when developing/modifying each student's individual plan through</p>	<p>Lynn Runnels, Director of Special Services</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>annual review conferences and triennial evaluations of handicapping conditions. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education</p>				
<p>SCHOOL CHOICE TRANSPORTATION: Before the start of the school year, parents of students attending schools designated as being in school improvement were notified of their rights to request a transfer to another school within the district that was not designated as being in school improvement. They were also notified that it would be the district's responsibility to provide transportation to any student transferring from any school designated as being in school improvement. Bentonville Public Schools has committed local funding up to 20% (\$181,526) of the district's Title I allocation to be used to provide school choice transportation for those students attending any school designated as being in School Improvement-- Year 1. Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Gary Compton, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>Title I-Part D funds totaling \$19,741 (2007-2008 carryover = \$8,547.94; 2008-2009 allocation = \$11,094) will be used to hire a</p>	<p>Brad Reed, Director of Student Services</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Outside Consultants 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>0.2 FTE Counselor that serves as the Transitional Liason for neglected and delinquent youth who reside at the area emergency shelter, YouthBridge, Inc., and attend Bentonville Public Schools. This counselor will be responsible for the enrolling, course selection and career planning for these students in an effort to help them better transition back into their home school or post-graduation plans. A separate Title I-Part D application will be submitted in collaboration with our YouthBridge, Inc. partners that provides how each students' individual academic needs will be addressed in regards to a transition plan, career plan, graduation plan, and any necessary academic improvement plans. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Total Budget:</p>	<p>\$1670404.08</p>
----------------------	---------------------

Intervention: District staff will be provided professional development opportunities in mathematics and science. Specific training initiatives/course offerings will be based upon district and building data analysis efforts as well as best practice in math and science as evidence by research based math and science initiatives. Whenever possible, professional learning opportunities in math and science will be embedded within each campuses' professional learning community structure. The expected result of the professional development offerings will be an increase in math and science achievement for all students.

Scientific Based Research: "Cognitively Guided Instruction", Carpenter, T., Heinemann, (1999). "Teaching and Learning Middle Grades Mathematics", Beckmann, C., and Thompson, D.R., Rubenstein, (2008). Elementary and Middle School Mathematics--Teaching Developmentally", 6th ed., Van de Walle, J.M., Allyn & Bacon, (2006). "Lessons For Algebraic Thinking", Kharas, M., Burns, K., Wickett, M., Math Solutions, (2002). "Investigation in Number, Data, and Space, Wittenberg, L., Economopoulous, K., TERC, (2004). "Navigating Through Algebra in Grades 6-8",

Friel, S., Rachlin, S., Doyle, D., Mygard, C., Rugalee, D., Ellis, M., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, (2001). "Writing in Science: How to Scaffold Instruction to Support Learning", Fulwiler, B., Heinemann, (2007). "Reading Aloud Across the Curriculum: How to Build Bridges in Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies", Laminack, L., Wadsworth, R., Heinmann, (2006).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title II-A funds will be used to hire a 1.0 FTE highly qualified Math Instructional Facilitator who will provide professional development throughout the school year for district math teachers that is focused on student learning needs as evidenced by district and school data analysis efforts.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Tamara Gibson, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	<p>Title II-A - Employee Salaries: \$80828.00 Title II-A - Employee Benefits: \$19299.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$100127</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the costs of copies, materials and supplies throughout the year when the district Staff Development Directors and the district's Math Instructional Facilitator meets with the district's Math Staff Development Instructional Leaders. These meetings/training sessions will focus on essential math standards, interpretation of math standards, creating, scoring and interpreting math common assessments, data analysis, math</p>	<p>Christie Alexander, Math Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Performance Assessments Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$500</p>

<p>instructional strategies, Benchmark strategies and the use of math manipulatives as evidenced by district and school data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the cost of copies, materials and supplies for the district Math Instructional Facilitator to provide job-embedded professional development throughout the school year to math teachers of general education students, math teachers of special education students and math teachers of ESOL students. Instruction will focus on essential math standards, interpretation of math standards, creating, scoring and interpreting math common assessments, data analysis, math instructional strategies, Benchmark strategies and the use of math manipulatives as evidenced by district and school data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Christie Alexander, Math Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$2000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$2000</p>
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional Development funds will</p>	<p>Christie Alexander, Math Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00</p> <hr/>

<p>be used to assist with the costs of copies, materials and supplies for the district Staff Development Department to offer a Summer Institute for its certified staff. Math courses offered will focus on essential math standards, the Investigations Math Curriculum, virtual math manipulatives and strategies for working with students who are struggling to learn math concepts. Action Type: Professional Development</p>				<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$500</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the cost of sponsoring a Marilyn Burns K-8 Math Solutions training called "About Teaching Mathematics, Part I. This training will be endorsed by the Arkansas Department of Education and we will open up registration to teachers throughout a four-five state region. Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Christie Alexander, Math Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Purchased Services: \$1500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$1500</p>
<p>The Staff Development Department will conduct on-going evaluations of the effectiveness of its professional development opportunities in mathematics and science through the use of the district's on-line, course specific evaluation instrument to be completed by teachers, district staff, central office staff and/or administrative staff.</p>	<p>Tamara Gibson, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>Additionally, building math instructional leaders will complete an annual summative evaluation on the effectiveness of the math staff development instructional leader program. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: The District's Director of Testing and Assessment will conduct an annual data analysis review of the 2008-2009 Augmented Assessment results to determine increases in student achievement in the areas of mathematics and science. These findings will be communicated to the Staff Development Department so they can determine the effectiveness of their professional development offerings and programs. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Karen Morton, Director of Testing and Assessment</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Performance Assessments 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the cost of copies, materials and supplies for the district instructional facilitator to provide job-embedded professional development throughout the school year to science teachers (grade 5 & 7) of general</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$500</p>

<p>education students, special education students and ESOL students. Instruction will focus on the interpretation of science standards, the utilization of instructional strategies and Benchmark strategies as evidenced by district and school data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional Development funds will be used to pay for substitutes for science teachers in grades 5 and 7 and Biology teachers of general education students, special education students and ESOL students to attend a day of staff development training focused on the strategies for writing in the content areas. Science open response items will be developed and scored. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$650.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$3000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$3650</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$108777</p>

Intervention: District Staff will be provided with professional development opportunities in literacy. Specific training initiatives/course offerings will be based upon district and building data analysis efforts as well as best practice in literacy as evidenced by research based literacy initiatives. Whenever possible, professional learning opportunities will be embedded within each campuses' professional learning community structure. The expected result of the professional development offerings will be an increase in literacy achievement for all students.

Scientific Based Research: "Best Practices in Writing Instruction: Solving Problems in the Teaching of Literacy", Graham, S., MacArthur, C.A., Fitzgerald, J., The Guilford Press, (2007).

"Understanding By Design", 2nd edition, Wiggins, G. and McTighe, J., Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2005. "Content Area Writing--Every Teacher's Guide", Daniels, H., Zemelman, S., Steineke, N., Heinemann, (2007). "Study Driven", Ray, K., Heinemann, (2006). "The Art of Teaching Reading", Calkins, L.M., McGeehon, (2001). "Deeper Reading: Comprehending Challenging Texts 4-12", Gallagher, K., Stenhouse, (2004).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title II-A funds will be used to hire a .75 FTE highly qualified grade 5-12 Literacy Instructional Facilitator who will provide professional development throughout the school year for district literacy teachers in grades 5-12 that is focused on student learning needs as evidenced by district and school data analysis efforts.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Judy Marquess, Director of Staff Development	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff 	<p>Title II-A - Employee Salaries: Title II-A - Employee Benefits:</p> <p>\$58581.00</p> <p>\$12682.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$71263</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to create a budget for the grade 5-12 district Literacy Instructional Facilitator. These funds will be used to purchase training materials and supplies as well as to help pay for workshop/conference travel expenses and to pay for professional memberships.</p> <p>Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside Consultants 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies:</p> <p>\$5000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$5000</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the costs of copies, materials and supplies throughout the</p>	Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Staff Performance Assessments 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies:</p> <p>\$500.00</p>

<p>year when the district Staff Development Directors and the district's Grade 5-12 Literacy Instructional Facilitator meets with the district's grade 5-12 Literacy Staff Development Instructional Leaders. These meetings/training sessions will focus on essential literacy standards, interpretation of literacy standards, the components of Reader's and Writer's Workshop, data analysis, instructional strategies and Benchmark strategies as evidenced by district and school data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$500</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the costs of copies, materials and supplies throughout the year when the district Staff Development Directors and the district's K-4 Literacy Instructional Facilitator meets with the district's grade K-4 Literacy Staff Development Instructional Leaders. These meetings/training sessions will focus on essential literacy standards, interpretation of literacy standards, the components of Reader's and Writer's Workshop, data analysis, instructional strategies and Benchmark strategies as evidenced by district and school data analysis. Action Type: Alignment</p>	<p>Sandra Dennison, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$500.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$500</p>

<p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the cost of copies, materials and supplies for the district grade 5-12 Literacy Instructional Facilitator to provide job-embedded professional development during the school day to grade 5-12 literacy teachers of general education students, literacy teachers of special education students and literacy teachers of ESOL students. Instruction will focus on essential literacy standards, interpretation of literacy standards, the components of Reader's and Writer's Workshop, data analysis, instructional strategies and Benchmark strategies as evidenced by district and school data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$2000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$2000</p>
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title II-A funds will be used to pay for substitutes for literacy teachers in grades 3-4 and 7-11 to attend three days of staff development training. This includes literacy teachers of general education students, SPED, students and ESOL students. The training will focus on the</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>Title II-A - Employee Salaries: \$34275.00 Title II-A - Employee Benefits: \$7425.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$41700</p>

<p>scoring of student writing on a district-wide formative assessment. Reading and writing open response items will be scored. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional Development funds will be used to pay for substitutes for literacy teachers in grades 5-6 to attend three days of staff development training. This includes literacy teachers of general education students, SPED, students and ESOL students. The training will focus on the scoring of student writing on a district-wide formative assessment. Reading and writing open response items will be scored. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$1728.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$7980.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$9708</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to assist with the costs of copies, materials, supplies and facilitator compensation for the district Staff Development Department to offer a Summer Institute for its certified staff. Literacy courses offered will focus on the literacy standards, the Bentonville Literacy Model and genre studies.</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$1000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$1000</p>

<p>Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the costs of copies, materials, and supplies for literacy teachers in grades 3-11 to attend three days of staff development training. This includes literacy teachers of general education students, SPED, students and ESOL students. The training will focus on the scoring of student writing on a district-wide formative assessment. Reading and writing open response items will be scored. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$2000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$2000</p>
<p>The Staff Development Department will conduct on-going evaluations of the effectiveness of its professional development opportunities in literacy through the use of the district's on-line, course specific evaluation instrument to be completed by teachers, district staff, central office staff and/or administrative staff. Additionally, building literacy instructional leaders will complete an annual summative evaluation on the effectiveness of the literacy staff development instructional leader</p>	<p>Judy Marquess, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

program. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation				
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: The District's Director of Testing and Assessment will conduct an annual data analysis review of the 2008-2009 Augmented Assessment results to determine increases in student achievement in the area of literacy. These findings will be communicated to the Staff Development Department so they can determine the effectiveness of their professional development offerings and programs. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Karen Morton, Director of Testing and Assessment	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Performance Assessments 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
State Professional Development funds will be used to provide substitutes, materials and supplies for three teachers from each K-4 campus to receive three days of training on the Bentonville Literacy Model. This training will center around Reader's and Writer's workshop. K-4 Literacy Staff Development Instructional Leaders will take one of the spots allotted to each campus. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Sandra Dennison, Literacy Instructional Facilitator	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$7938.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$1719.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$9657
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND	Countess Hodges,	Start: 07/01/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	Title II-A \$20753.00 -

<p>SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title II-A funds will be used to hire a 0.25 FTE highly qualified Literacy Specialist for grades K-4 to provide professional development and model classroom training throughout the school year for district literacy teachers, literacy coaches, and Reading Recovery teachers focusing on student learning needs as evidenced by district and school data analysis efforts. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Executive Director of Elementary Curriculum</p>	<p>End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>Employee Salaries: Title II-A - \$4493.46 Employee Benefits: <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$25246.46</p>
<p>Reading Recovery teachers will be provided professional development opportunities (minimum of 6), throughout the school year. Sessions, at least four, will include observations of Reading Recovery teachers teaching a child behind a two way glass. Continuing Contact sessions provide collaborative opportunities for teachers to remain responsive to individual children, to question the effectiveness of their practices, to get help from their peers on particularly hard-to-teach children, and to consider how new knowledge in the field may influence their practice. The Reading Recovery Teacher Leader will also visit Reading Recovery teachers and observe a Reading Recovery lesson.</p>	<p>Sandra Dennison, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p><hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: The District Literacy Coach will provide professional development and training for three K-4 building Literacy Coaches with the purpose of continuous improvement and renewal in each building by implementing the Bentonville Literacy Model. The model uses literacy as a tool for measuring school improvement. The district coach visits buildings on a regular basis and mentors the building coaches as they are working with children and with teachers. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Sandra Dennison, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to pay for substitutes for literacy teachers in grades 5-8 to attend three days of staff development training. This includes literacy teachers of general education students, SPED, students and ESOL students. The training will focus on the intense-explicit instruction in reading. The Strategic Instruction Model, the Learning Strategies, and Content Literacy will be the focus of the training</p>	<p>Jerri Foster, Literacy Instructional Facilitator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$3680.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$820.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$4500</p>

with emphasis on phonics, vocabulary and comprehension. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development				
Total Budget:				\$173074.46

Intervention: District staff will be provided professional development offerings that will afford each staff member the opportunity to attain their sixty hour minimum of required professional development as set forth by the Arkansas Department of Education. Specific training initiatives/course offerings will be based upon district and building data analysis efforts, needs assessments, and best practice in professional development planning, delivery, and evaluation. Whenever possible, professional learning opportunities will be embedded within each campuses' professional learning community structure. The expected result of the professional development offerings will be an increase in academic achievement for all students.

Scientific Based Research: "Standards for Staff Development", National Staff Development Council, (2001). "Classroom Walkthrough with Reflective Practice", Charles, D., Teachscape, (2006). "The Three-Minute Classroom Walk-Through: Changing School Supervisory Practice One Teacher At A Time", Downey, Carolyn J., Steffy, Betty E., English, Fenwick W., Frase, Larry E., and Poston, William, E., Corwin Press (2004). "Total Instructional Alignment", Carter, L., Solution Tree, (2007). "Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work", DuFour, R., DuFour, B., and Eaker, R., Solution Tree, (2008). "Classroom Instruction That Works", Marzano, R., Pickering, D., Pollock, J., Pearson, (2005). "Ahead of the Curve", Reeves, D., Solution Tree, (2007). "Results Now: How We Can Achieve Unprecedented Improvements in Teaching and Learning", Schmoker, M., ACSD, (2006).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional development funds will be used to hire a 1.8 FTE highly qualified Director(s) of Staff Development and a .75 FTE administrative assistant. These individuals will coordinate the process of assessing staff professional development needs, determining priorities for staff development, and creating a district	Gary Compton, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office 	PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$33581.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$189064.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$222645

<p>professional development plan targeted at increasing student achievement. Additionally, the Directors and the administrative assistant will help manage the record keeping system for all the in-district and out-of-district trainings for certified staff members. They will also oversee the district staff development budget. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Title II-A and State Professional Development funds will be used to provide stipends to district Staff Development Committee members – which also includes the “Staff Development Instructional Leaders.” This committee will be made up of certified, classified and administrative staff. The district Staff Development Directors as well as the Math and Literacy Instructional Facilitators will work closely with these individuals to continually assess the professional development needs of all staff. Data analysis findings will be coupled with on-going needs</p>	<p>Judy Marquess, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers 	<p>Title II-A - Employee Salaries: \$16500.00 Title II-A - Employee Benefits: \$3573.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$6666.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$30300.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$57039</p>

<p>assessments in order to create a District Staff Development Plan that ultimately results in increased student achievement for general education populations and sub-populations. Staff Development Instructional leaders will also help district staff development personnel plan and implement training opportunities to address specific campus and/or district needs. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional Development funds will be used by the Staff Development Department to provide staff development opportunities for all certified staff members during ten (10) designated days built into the school calendar. These funds will be used to pay for consultant/facilitator fees, copies, materials, and supplies. These ten (10) days are designed to help all staff reach their 60 hour minimum of required professional development as set forth by the Arkansas Department of Education.</p>	<p>Tamara Gibson, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Community Leaders • Computers • District Staff • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Purchased Services: \$57238.74 PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$20000.00 <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$77238.74</p>

Additionally, each teacher/administrator in the school/district shall have an individual professional development plan that has been developed in cooperation and collaboration with the employee and the school and or district. These individual plans shall include: Teachers: 6 hours of educational technology training; 2 hours of parental involvement training; 2 hours of Arkansas History training (as defined in Act 2095 of 2005) for regular classroom teachers in grades K-4 and Social Studies teachers in grades 5, 6 and 8. Staff members may select some of the courses/training initiatives that they attend to meet their 60 hour requirement, providing they secure pre-approval from their building administrator. Pursuant to Act 1185 of 2005 an individual may be entitled to up to twelve (12) hours of professional development credit approved by the district/school which may be applied toward the sixty (60) hour professional development requirement for that time period at the beginning of each school year which is used to plan and prepare

curriculum or develop other instructional material provided: a) the time is spent in his/her instructional classroom, office or media center at the public school; b) the time is prior to the first student teacher interaction day of the school year; c) the time is spent in the focus areas listed in Section 5.02 of the Rules Governing Professional Development.

Administrators: 6 hours of educational technology training; 3 hours of parental involvement training; some training in data disaggregation, fiscal management and instructional leadership.

Staff Development Days/Training Initiatives for 2008-09 –

Traditional Schedule:

8.11.08-- Building/District Initiatives*(see below);

8.12.08-- Building/District Initiatives*; 8.13.08-- Arkansas History (K-4 regular classroom staff)- 2 hrs., Building/District Initiatives*-4 hrs.;

8.13.08--Auxiliary PLC Teams ** (see below);

8.15.08--Dr. Compton – Vision, Mission, Data and Goals-3 hrs., Building/District Initiatives*-3 hrs.;

10.13.08--Data Disaggregation/AIP/IRI, Building/District Initiatives*; 10.13.08-- Auxiliary PLC Teams**

(pending Principal approval); 11.24.08-- FLEX-IDEAS courses OR Building/District Initiatives* (pending Principal approval); 11.25.08--FLEX-IDEAS courses OR Building/District Initiatives* (pending Principal approval); 1.12.09--Solution Tree-Response to Intervention Training for ETE, CGE, SCE, GT, MJE, CES, REB; 1.12.09--Solution Tree-Response to Intervention Training for AGE, CPE, TJE, Technology Staff Development-menu of courses OR Building/District Initiatives* (pending Principal approval); 1.19.09--Solution Tree -Response to Intervention Training for AGE, CPE, TJE; 1.19.09--ETE, CGE, SCE, MJE, CES, REB, GT -Tech menu of courses OR Building/District Initiatives* (pending Principal approval); 2.16.09--FLEX-IDEAS courses OR Building/District Initiatives* (pending Principal approval); Building/District Initiatives: Mission/Vision, Instructional Strategies, Building Collaborative Teams, Essential Outcomes-Course Specific, Common Assessment-Course

<p>Specific; Data Analysis-Benchmark, SAT 10 Target Tests, Comm Assess. Etc.; SMART Goals; Vertical/Horizontal Curriculum Alignment; Response to Intervention; Lesson Design/TIA; Arkansas History; Parental Involvement. **Auxiliary PLC Teams: Music, Art, PE, Library-Media, SPED, Counselors, ESL, Reading Recovery/Literacy Coaches, Instructional Specialists, Title 1 Teachers Staff Development Days/Training Initiatives 2008-09 – Non-Traditional Schedule: Same training initiatives as above – four different dates from traditional (7/28, 7/29, 7/30 and 9/2 instead of 8/11, 8/12, 8/13 and 10/13). Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the</p>	<p>Tamara Gibson, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$2500.00</p>

costs of copies, materials and supplies for all district administrators to participate in administrative professional development throughout the year. Note training dates and topics below: 07/21/08--TRIAND Updates; 07/24/08--Admin- Back to School "Kick-off"; 08/12/08--High Yield Strategies-Administrative Luncheon; 08/28/08--Classroom Walkthrough Initial Training for new Administrators Day 1; 09/18/08--Working with Your Campus Budget and Facilities/Maintenance and Custodial Staff-new Administrators; 09/23/08--K-6 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip; 09/23/08--Grades 7-12 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip; 09/30/08--"Results Now" Book Study for Principals, Assistant Principals and Directors (Introduction and Section I: Reality and Illusion in the Public Schools); 10/02/08--Classroom Walkthrough Initial Training for new Administrators Day 2; 11/11/08--K-6 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip; 11/11/08--Grades 7-12 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip; 11/24/08--"Results Now" Book Study for Principals, Assistant Principals and Directors

ACTION BUDGET: \$2500

<p>(Section II: Literacy Education: The Greatest Opportunity of All thru Sect III: Learning and Leading in the Professional Learning Community and Conclusion/Appendices; 12/04/08--Appraisal Training- Fair Teacher Dismissal Act-new Administrators; 02/12/09--Interviewing, Hiring and Workplace Ethics-new Administrators; 03/10/09--K-6 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip; 03/10/09-- Grades 7-12 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip; 03/31/09--PLC's and RTI-Glows, Grows and More - Principals, Assistant Principals and Directors; 05/12/09--K-6 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip; 05/12/09--Grades 7-12 Classroom Walkthrough Field Trip. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>State Professional Development funds will be spread among each of the fifteen (15) Bentonville campuses in order to assist with actions outlined in their building ACSIP plans. These monies will be distributed by using the following formula: \$125.00 per teacher given to each building (grades 7-12); \$97.65 per teacher given to</p>	<p>Judy Marquess, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>each building (grades K-6.) Each building's ACSIP plan reflects the allocation and uses of their state professional development funds. Action Type: Professional Development</p>				
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the costs of facilitator compensation, copies, materials and supplies for the district to provide New Teacher Orientation to all teachers newly hired by the Bentonville School District for the 2008-09 school year. The training will take place on August 5-7 and will cover Arkansas Frameworks, assessment, lesson design, Response to Intervention, Professional Learning Communities, instructional strategies, teacher evaluation, staff development, technology and demonstration classrooms. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Judy Marquess, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Community Leaders • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$4500.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$228.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$1050.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$5778</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the costs of registration,</p>	<p>Tamara Gibson, Director of</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants 	<p>PD (State-223) - \$3000.00</p>

<p>lodging, meals and mileage reimbursement for three members of the district Staff Development Department to attend the Professional Learning Communities at Work Conference on July 29-31, 2008 in Tulsa, OK. Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Staff Development</p>	<p>End: 06/30/2009</p>		<p>Purchased Services:</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$3000</p>
<p>State Professional Development funds will be used to cover the costs of registration, lodging, meals, and airfare for two members of the district Staff Development Department and two Staff Development Instructional leaders to attend the Assessment Summit: Ahead of the Curve on October 29-November 1, 2008 in Atlanta, GA. Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Judy Marquess, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants 	<p>PD (State-223) - Purchased Services: \$8000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$8000</p>
<p>NSLA funds will be used to cover the costs of substitutes at ten K-6 campuses so that five staff members from each of the campuses can spend a half a day in training on the district's new On-line Lesson Plan Program. These trainers will then go back to their campus and train remaining staff members. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional</p>	<p>Tamara Gibson, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>NSLA (State -281) - Employee Benefits: \$433.00 NSLA (State -281) - Employee Salaries: \$2000.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$2433</p>

Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
State Professional Development funds will be used to assist with the costs of copies, materials, supplies and facilitator compensation for the district Staff Development Department to offer a Summer Institute for its certified staff. General courses will focus on educational technology and embedding instructional strategies into content area teaching. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Tamara Gibson, Director of Staff Development	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	PD (State-223) - Materials & Supplies: \$1000.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Benefits: \$650.00 PD (State-223) - Employee Salaries: \$3000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$4650
The Staff Development Department will conduct on-going evaluations of the effectiveness of its professional development opportunities through the use of the district's on-line, course specific evaluation instrument to be completed by teachers, district staff, central office staff and/or administrative staff. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Judy Marquess, Director of Staff Development	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office 	<hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: NSLA funds will be used to cover the costs of securing two outside	Suzanne Nicholas, Director of Federal Programs	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside Consultants 	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$12200.00 <hr/>

facilitators from Solution Tree to provide Response to Intervention Training to K-6 certified staff on January 12th and 19th. This training will provide our staff with a consistent framework of understanding with regards to Response to Intervention and serve as a springboard for each campus as they continue to create and implement their RTI plans. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development				ACTION BUDGET: \$12200
--	--	--	--	------------------------

Total Budget:	\$395483.74
---------------	-------------

Intervention: The district will provide technological support to all staff and students in an effort to enhance instructional delivery and increase academic achievement.

Scientific Based Research: "Multimodal Learning Through Media: What the Research Says", Metiri Group - Commissioned by Cisco, 2008. "Technology in Schools: What the Research Says", Metiri Group - Commissioned by Cisco, 2006. "Technology's Effectiveness for Student Learning", Tally, B., EDC Center for Children & Technology, 2006.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Renaissance applications are available at all buildings and help assess student skill level in literacy and mathematics, track student growth, and define student yearly progress. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kathy McInroe, Director of Technology	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • Performance Assessments • Teachers • Title Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Technology staff development courses offered by the district are focused on curriculum integration. Administrators receive training specific to using technology to	Kathy McInroe, Director of Technology	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

enhance their productivity. In addition, new teachers receive information regarding student and staff Acceptable Use Policies, copyright policies and cyber ethics. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
District administrators have Blackberry handheld devices for use when conducting Classroom Walk Through observations. The device uses an electronic checklist for quick data gathering that is then uploaded into a database that allows administrators to evaluate instructional trends, successes and areas for improvement. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kathy McInroe	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: Through the use of Classroom Walk Through data, the district Technology Department works closely with administrators to understand how technology is being used in classrooms for instruction and identifying areas that require further professional development in the use of technology for instruction. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Kathy McInroe, Director of Technology	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: All classrooms have teacher and student Internet connected computers. All buildings have instructional computer labs that can be used for classroom computer project development or individual student research. Currently, the district has 155 multimedia classrooms and 149 Smart Classrooms. Each building houses one instructional computer	Kathy McInroe	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Computers • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

<p>lab manager who serves to provide daily technical support to staff and students. Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>Bentonville implements the ISTE NETS student standards in grades K-4 through direct instruction using software purchased to target the standards. All K-4 students have a Computer Lab class scheduled on a weekly basis and taught by a Computer Lab Manager. An emphasis is placed on working with the classroom teacher to develop projects that reflect both what is happening in the classroom and what technology skills students are learning. In Grades 5-6, students integrate technology skills into classroom work. Students in grades 7-12 acquire and practice specific technology skills taught through the Career and Technical Education department. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Kathy McInroe, Director of Technology</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The district's Technology Department will conduct an annual review of our Technology Problem Tracking database to evaluate the level of technology support provided to staff. All district employees have access to entering a technology related issue into the database which then notifies the Technology Department of the need for assistance. This IT database tracks technology issues that appear to be occurring too frequently, buildings experiencing unique technology problems, length of time technology problems are posted open in the database and the timeline progression for resolving the technology issue. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Kathy McInroe, Director of Technology</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

<p>Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: The District Staff Development Department and District Technology Department have collaborated in the creation and utilization of a web-based application that will enable teachers in grades K-6 to create on-line lesson plans. This on-line lesson planner will incorporate the essential elements of lesson design and will include features that will promote collaborative lesson planning. In addition, through the use of drop down menus and toggle clicks, teachers will be able to incorporate SLE's from the Total Instruction Alignment document as well as the Classroom Instruction that Works instructional strategies. The Technology Department will focus efforts on the creation of the application and training on the technical aspects of the application, while the Staff Development Department will focus its efforts on deepening teacher knowledge on the essential components of an effective lesson plan.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Tammy Gibson, Director of Staff Development</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The district's Technology Department will conduct an annual teacher survey to determine the effectiveness of technology use in the classroom as an instructional tool, availability of technology for instructional use, and the usefulness of the provided technology related professional development.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional</p>	<p>Kathy McInroe, Director of Technology</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • Teachers 	<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
Total Budget:				\$0

Priority 2: To provide a safe school environment for students and teachers.

1. In 2007-08, the number of Washington Jr. High School (WJHS) students involved in drug, alcohol, and tobacco incidents was 10. In 2006-07, the number of WJHS students involved in drug, alcohol, and tobacco incidents was 5. In 2005-06, the number of WJHS students involved in drug, alcohol, and tobacco incidents was 5.
2. In 2007-08, the number of Lincoln Jr. High School (LJHS) students involved in drug, alcohol, and tobacco incidents was 4. In 2006-07, the number of LJHS students involved in drug, alcohol, and tobacco incidents was 8. In 2005-06, the number of LJHS students involved in drug, alcohol, and tobacco incidents was 10.
3. In 2007-08, the number of WJHS student assaults was 3 and LJHS student assaults was 0. In 2006-07, the number of WJHS student assaults was 10 and LJHS student assaults was 1. In 2005-06, the number of WJHS student assaults was 0 and LJHS student assaults was 0.
4. In 2007-08, the total number of student discipline incidents at Spring Hill Middle School (SHMS) was 605, at Ruth Barker Middle School (RBMS) was 226, and at Old High Middle School (OHMS) was 699. In 2006-07, the total number of student discipline incidents at Spring Hill Middle School (SHMS) was 780, at Ruth Barker Middle School (RBMS) was 293, and at Old High Middle School (OHMS) was 658. In 2005-06, the total number of student discipline incidents at Spring Hill Middle School (SHMS) was 324 and Old High Middle School (OHMS) was 408.
5. In 2007-08, the number of Bentonville High School (BHS) students involved in drugs, alcohol and tobacco incidents was 90. In 2006-07, the number of Bentonville High School (BHS) students involved in drugs, alcohol and tobacco incidents was 102. In 2005-06, the number of Bentonville High School (BHS) students involved in drugs, alcohol and tobacco incidents was 42.
6. Attendance Rate: In 2007-2008, the attendance rate for the district was 95.02%.

Supporting Data:

Goal All schools in the Bentonville Public School District will maintain a safe and drug free environment.

Benchmark Use of drugs, student assaults and total number of discipline incidents will decrease overall by 0.5% during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Intervention: Incorporate activities in elementary and secondary schools that teach the dangers of drug use while engaging students in the learning process that reinforces prevention activities.				
Scientific Based Research: School Based Practices and Programs that Promote Safe and Drug Free Schools, Guthrie, P. (2002).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Title IV-A funds will be allocated to each campus to provide appropriate materials,	Suzanne Nicholas, Director of	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	Title IV-A - Purchased Services: \$25017.00

<p>supplies, and equipment as well as expenses related to substitutes, travel, meals, lodging, and registration to Character Education training in order to develop and incorporate character education programs that promote a safe school campus and teach the dangers of drugs while engaging students in the learning process that reinforces prevention activities. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Federal Programs</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	<p>Title IV-A - Materials & Supplies: Title IV-A - Employee Salaries: Title IV-A - Employee Benefits:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$12259.87</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$440.00</p> <p style="text-align: right;">\$104.00</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$37820.87</p>
<p>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO BUILDINGS: The School Board Policies and Procedures Committee will continually review and revise the district's student handbooks and discipline policies to ensure that all policies and procedures ensure for a safe and drug free environment. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Gary Compton, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>
<p>The district's Crisis Intervention plan will be updated annually and included in each school's Student Services Plan. Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Brad Reed, Director of Student Services</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	<hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$</p>

Action Type: Parental Engagement				
The district's Counseling Department will annually review and update each building's Student Services Plan to ensure for a detailed, comprehensive counseling program that includes a cohesive crisis intervention plan as well as programs that promote good character education and drug-free schools. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	Brad Reed, Director of Student Services	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • District Staff • Outside Consultants • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Director of Student Services will annually review the number of student discipline referrals as well as student incidents involving assault and use of drugs and alcohol to determine if the safe and drug free interventions that have been implemented are being effective. Action Type: Program Evaluation	Brad Reed, Director of Student Services	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$37820.87

Priority 3: To create a healthy school environment that supports consistent health, nutrition and physical activity for all students.

Supporting Data:

1. The Bentonville Public School Body Mass Index data presented indicates the percentage of students who may be at risk of poor academic performance. BODY MASS INDEX DATA SY 2007-08: of the 5,812 student population required to be assessed, 4,645 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and underweight: Overweight Males: 14.6%, Underweight Males: 2.8%, Overweight Females: 11.1%, Underweight Females: 2.5%. BODY MASS INDEX DATA SY 2006-2007: of the 11,939 student population, 8,729 students were assessed. Of the

students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and underweight: Overweight Males: 14.6%, Underweight Males: 2.4%, Overweight Females: 12.2%, Underweight Females: 2.5%. BODY MASS INDEX DATA SY 2005-2006: of the 10,205 student population, 8,013 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and underweight: Overweight Males: 15%, Underweight Males: 2.3%, Overweight Females: 11.2%, Underweight Females: 2.6%.

2. The Bentonville Public School 2007-2008 Health Index Module #7, Healthy Promotion for Staff, was identified as the area needing improvement based on a module score of 40.0%. The Bentonville Public School 2006-2007 Health Index Module #8, Family & Community Involvement, was identified as the area needing improvement based on a module score of 74.5%. The Bentonville Public School 2005-2006 Health Index Module #8, Family & Community Involvement, was identified as the area needing improvement based on a module score of 75%.
3. The Bentonville Public School's free and reduced price meal eligibility data for the 2007-08 school year was: 75.84% paid; 6.54% reduced; 17.62% free. The Bentonville Public School's free and reduced price meal eligibility data for the 2006-07 school year was: 75.0% paid; 7.0% reduced; 18% free. The Bentonville Public School's free and reduced price meal eligibility data for the 2005-06 school year was: 74.4% paid; 7.6% reduced; 18% free.

Goal Bentonville Public Schools will provide support for staff and students in making healthy lifestyle choices by increasing staff participation in the district provided health screenings as well as decreasing the number of at-risk for or overweight students.

Benchmark There will be a 0.2% difference in the 2008-2009 student BMI results indicating healthier lifestyles are being practiced.

Benchmark There will be a 20% active participation rate of all staff members in the district provided healthy screening program.

Intervention: Bentonville Public Schools will implement programs to assist staff members in the improvement of their overall wellness.				
Scientific Based Research: "Healthy People 2010: The Cornerstone for Prevention", US Department of Health and Human Services, Jones & Bartlett, (2001).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Bentonville Public Schools will implement health screenings to all staff members who qualify for the specific screening chosen. Action Type: Wellness	Steve Potts, Executive Director of Human Resources	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Bentonville Public School District will provide flu shots to all active staff members who have signed up in the prior year. All new staff members will be given access to flu shots. Action Type: Wellness	Steve Potts, Executive Director of Human Resources	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Outside Consultants 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

			• Teachers	
The Bentonville Public School District will ensure that each staff member is emailed a health newsletter via inner school email on a quarterly basis. Action Type: Wellness	Steve Potts, Executive Director of Human Resources	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Nutrition and Physical Activity Committee as part of the ACSIP Committee will evaluate the effectiveness of the staff healthy lifestyle program by annually reviewing staff participation in provided health screenings. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Steve Potts, Executive Director of Human Resources	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Community Leaders • Teachers 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Intervention: Bentonville Public Schools will encourage strategies and activities that practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage all students to make healthy food and physical activity choices resulting in increased academic performance.

Scientific Based Research: Arkansas Fights Fat: Translating Research Into Policy to Combat Childhood and Adolescent Obesity. Health Affairs, 25, no. 4 (2006): 992-1004.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The Bentonville School District will support schools in the alignment and implementation of the current Arkansas Nutrition and Physical Education and Physical Activity Standards and Arkansas Curriculum Frameworks. Resources, professional development opportunities and training will be provided to increase knowledge and advance skills for successful implementation. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Wellness	Kay Jacoby, Executive Director of Secondary Curriculum	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Staff • Central Office • Community Leaders • Outside Consultants • Teachers • Teaching Aids 	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Bentonville Public School District will support PE-4 Life pilot program that we currently	Countess Hodges, Executive	Start: 07/01/2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Office • District Staff 	ACTION BUDGET: \$

have implemented at the middle school level for the 2008-09 school year. The district will provide support and resources that will provide a facility and staff to ensure the success of this program. Action Type: Wellness	Director of Elementary Education	End: 06/30/2009	• Teachers	
The Bentonville Public School District will ensure compliance of both the Arkansas Nutrition and Physical Education and Physical Activity Standards and Arkansas Curriculum Frameworks through meeting or exceeding the number of minutes per Physical Activity per pupil and through the data collected from the PE-4 Life program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Wellness	Countess Hodges, Executive Director of Elementary Curriculum	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
The Nutrition and Physical Activity Committee as part of the ACSIP Committee will evaluate the effectiveness of the student health intervention by annually reviewing student BMI data results to determine if a decrease in at-risk or overweight students is being realized. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness	Steve Potts, Executive Director of Human Resources	Start: 07/01/2008 End: 06/30/2009	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • Computers	ACTION BUDGET: \$
Total Budget:				\$0

Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Classroom Teacher	Randall Simmermon	OHMS Teacher	Wellness
Community Representative	Jordan Loyd	Student	Wellness
Community Representative	Shirley Borhauer	State Representative (Retired)	Wellness
Community Representative	Travis Riggs	School Board President	Wellness
District-Level Professional	Brad Reed	Director of Student Services	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Countess Hodges	Exec. Director of Elementary Curriculum	ACSIP Leadership; Math; Literacy; Wellness

District-Level Professional	Gary Compton	Superintendent	ACSIP Leadership; Wellness
District-Level Professional	Judy Marquess	Grades 5-12 Staff Development Director	ACSIP Leadership; Math; Literacy
District-Level Professional	Karen Morton	Director of Testing and Assessment	Literacy; Math
District-Level Professional	Kathy McIntire	Director of Technology	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Kay Jacoby	Exec. Director of Secondary Curriculum	ACSIP Leadership; Math; Literacy; Wellness
District-Level Professional	Kim Fernandez	Assistant Director of Special Services	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Lynn Runnels	Director of Special Services	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Mary Denny	Interim Director of Food Service	Wellness
District-Level Professional	Scott Passmore	Director of Facilities and Maintenance	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Sterling Ming	Exec. Director of Finance	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Steve Potts	Exec. Director of Human Resources	ACSIP Leadership, Wellness
District-Level Professional	Suzanne Nicholas	Director of Federal Programs	ACSIP Leadership
District-Level Professional	Tamara Gibson	Grades K-4 Staff Development Director	ACSIP Leadership; Literacy; Math
District-Level Professional	Waynette Chambers	Assistant Director of Special Services	ACSIP Leadership
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Christie Alexander	Math Instructional Facilitator	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Jerri Foster	Literacy Instructional Facilitator--Grades 5-8	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Linda Koppenhaver	ESL Specialist	Literacy
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Martha Neal	TJE Food Service Manager	Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Sandy Dennison	Literacy Instructional Facilitator--Grades K-4	Literacy
Principal	Jason Brunner	OHMS Assistant Principal	Wellness
Principal	Kathy Murry	BHS Interim Principal	ACSIP Leadership
Principal	Lisa St. John	AGE Principal	ACSIP Leadership
Principal	Marilyn Gilchrist	OHMS Principal	ACSIP Leadership
Principal	Rose Peterson	LJHS Principal	Wellness
Principal	Rose Spaulding	BHS Assistant Principal	Wellness