

## School Plan

MELBOURNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
P.O. Box 250, Melbourne, AR 72556

### Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2010-2011

It is the mission of the Melbourne Elementary School to educate students in a safe environment that is accessible to all students. Our school will provide a relevant, challenging curriculum promoting higher-order thinking skills, technological skills, problem-solving abilities, and the experiences necessary to be a responsible citizen.

Grade Span: K-6

Title I: Title I Schoolwide

School Improvement: MS

#### Table of Contents

##### Priority 1: Literacy

**Goal:** To improve open response reading and writing skills in literacy across the curriculum with emphasis on the practical and content reading passages

##### Priority 2: Math

**Goal:** To improve the open response skills in mathematics, with emphasis on Data Analysis, Measurement, Algebra, Numbers and Operations

##### Priority 3: Wellness Policy

**Goal:** The Melbourne School District will provide support necessary for the students to make Healthy Lifestyle Choice by implementing strategies and actions to aid in decreasing the average BMI on the annual student screening.

##### Priority 4: Science

**Goal:** To Improve Science Skills with Emphasis on Open Response in Physical Science, Earth and Space Science, Life Science, and Nature of Science

Priority 1: To Improve Literacy Skills with Emphasis on Open Response Skills in Practical, Literary, and Content Reading and in Comprehension:

- Melbourne Elementary – Benchmark – Grade 3 – Literacy – Combined Population: In 2008, 31 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 70% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 47 students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the 2008-2010 open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that students scored lower in open response, 52.3%, than in multiple-choice, 63.6%. The 2008-2010 average for the writing strands is 68.8%. Areas of concern the three-year data are found in open response for Literary Reading, 58.7%, Content Reading, 47. Practical Reading, 51.2%, and Multiple-Choice Practical Reading, 57.1%. Areas of concern in Writing are Style, 60%, Content, 61.3%, and Multiple-Choice Writing, 64.2%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
    - R.9.3.7: Comprehension: Ask questions and support answers by connecting prior knowledge with literal and inferential information found in the text
    - R.9.3.9: Comprehension: Draw inferences, such as conclusions or generalizations, and support the with text evidence and/or personal experiences
    - R.9.3.10: Determining importance to make near Organize information and events logically
    - R.9.3.13: Summarizing and synthesizing for meaning: Summarization of major points found in nonfiction materials
    - R.11.3.1: Vocabulary and Word Study: Use context clues to determine the precise meaning of new words
    - R.11.3.3: Vocabulary and Word Study: Recognize the relationship between a pronoun and its referent
    - W.5.3.1: Purposes, Topics, Forms, and Audiences: Students shall demonstrate competency in writing for a variety of purposes topics and audiences employing a wide range of forms. Write for a specific purpose and audience
- Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 5 students with disabilities were tested and 40% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the data for 2008-10 revealed that students scored lower in Open Response, 22.9%, than in Multiple-Choice, 41.7%. Students averaged scoring 51.5% in the Writing during the three-year average. Areas of concern are found in Open Response in Literary Reading, 31.3%, Practical Reading, 12.5%, and Content Reading, 25%. In the writing strands, areas of concern are found in Multiple-Choice Writing 37.5%, Style, 48.1%, Content and Sentence Formation, 50%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 31 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 70% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 47 students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the 2008-2010 open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages revealed that students scored lower in open response, 52.3%, than in multiple-choice, 63.6%. The 2008-2010 average for the writing strands is 68.8%. Areas of concern the three-year data are found in open response for Literary Reading, 58.7%, Content Reading, 47. Practical Reading, 51.2%, and Multiple-Choice Practical Reading, 57.1%. Areas of concern in Writing are Style, 60%, Content, 61.3%, and Multiple-Choice Writing, 64.2%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
  - R.9.3.7: Comprehension: Ask questions and support answers by connecting prior knowledge with literal and inferential information found in the text
  - R.9.3.9: Comprehension: Draw inferences, such as conclusions or generalizations, and support the with text evidence and/or personal experiences
  - R.9.3.10: Determining importance to make near Organize information and events logically
  - R.9.3.13: Summarizing and synthesizing for meaning: Summarization of major points found in nonfiction materials
  - R.11.3.1: Vocabulary and Word Study: Use context clues to determine the precise meaning of new words
  - R.11.3.3: Vocabulary and Word Study: Recognize the relationship between a pronoun and its referent
  - W.5.3.1: Purposes, Topics, Forms, and Audiences: Students shall demonstrate competency in writing for a variety of purposes topics and audiences employing a wide range of forms. Write for a specific purpose and audience

- 21 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 34 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008, 30 Caucasian students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. Also in 2008, one African American was tested and scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 43 Caucasian students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 2 African American students were tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. There were no LEP students enrolled in 2008-2010.
2. Melbourne Elementary – Benchmark – Grade 4 – Literacy – Combined Population: In 2008, 41 students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 41 students were tested and 71% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 43 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis data for the three reading strands for 2008-10 revealed that students averaged scoring lower in Open Response, 55.3%, than in multiple-choice, 66.1%. The 2008-10 average for the writing strands is 73.4%. Areas of concern for the three-year data are found in open response in Content Reading, 50.8%, and Practical Reading, 55.0%. An area of concern in the Writing portion is found in Multiple-Choice Writing, 62.5%, and Style, 68.8%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
    - R.11.4.1: Use context clues to determine the precise meaning of new words
    - R.9.4.1: Organize prior knowledge and new information to make meaning of the text
    - R.9.4.2: Make connections that demonstrate a deeper understanding of text related to self, text, and/or world
    - R.9.4.5: Generate questions that reflect active engagement in the text
    - R.9.4.6: Use additional resources to support answers to questions formulated before, during, and after reading
    - R.9.4.7: Infer the purpose of the text to expand comprehension
    - R.9.4.9: Use inference to expand understanding of content knowledge
    - R.9.4.12: Summarize content of selection, identify important ideas and providing details for each important idea
    - R.10.4.6: Use graphic organizers, including main idea/detail maps and outlines to make meaning of the reading selection
    - R.10.4.15: Utilize functional texts, including brochures, newspaper articles, and magazines, to accomplish tasks
    - R.11.4.1: Use context clues to determine the precise meaning of new words
    - R.11.4.4: Identify figurative language in reading
    - W.4.4.6: Create an introduction that hooks the reader
    - W.5.4.1: Write for a general audience (i.e., newspaper and website, etc.)
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 20 students with disabilities were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. The comparison of the multiple-choice and open response revealed that students averaged scoring lower in open-response, 29.2%, than in multiple-choice, 41.7%. The writing average was 51.8%. Areas of concern are found in open-response in Content Reading, 25%, Literary and Practical Reading, 31.3%. Areas of concern in Writing are Content, 48.1%, Style, 42.5%, and Sentence Formation, 47.5%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 27 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 18 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 30 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 70% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008, 27 of the students tested were Caucasian and 69% scored proficient or advanced. One Hispanic student was tested and scored proficient or advanced. Also in 2008, 1 Asian/Pacific Islander was tested and scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38 Caucasian students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 African American student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Native American student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 42 Caucasian students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. There were no LEP students in the school in 2008-2010.
  3. Melbourne Elementary – Benchmark – Grade 5 – Literacy – Combined Population: In 2008, 46 students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 41 students were tested and 88% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 34 students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the 2008-10 data revealed that students averaged scoring lower in open response, 62.3%, than in multiple-choice, 71.2%, in the three reading domains. The 2008-10 average for the writing strands is 81.1%. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Content Reading, 58.3%, and Practical Reading, 57.9%. Areas of concern in Writing are Content and Style, 70.4%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that students scored lower in:
    - R.9.5.3: Generate questions to establish purposes for reading
    - R.9.5.11: Use such comprehension strategies as establishing purpose, inferring, and summarizing to determine essential information.
    - R.9.5.12: Identify main ideas and supporting evidence in short reading passages
    - R.9.5.13: Use the text features to locate and recall information, with emphasis on fonts/effects and illustrations/photographs
    - R.9.5.19: Summarize information including main idea and significant supporting details
    - R.10.5.4: Read a variety of informational text, including textbooks, newspaper magazines, and other instructional materials
    - R.10.5.8: Locate information to support opinions,

- predictions, and conclusions. • W.4.5.7: Create an effective lead sentence for each paragraph by using such features as questions or exclamations
- Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 6 students with disabilities were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the test data for 2008-2010 revealed that students with disabilities scored lower in open response, 27.1%, than in multiple-choice, 41.7%. Students with disabilities scored an average of 47.1% in Writing. Areas of concern are found in Open Response in Literary & Practical Reading, 25%, and Open Response and Multiple-Choice in Content Reading, 31.3%. Areas of concern in Writing are found in Content, 36.9%, Style, 35%, and Multiple Choice Writing, 43.8%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 25 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 84% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 25 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 84% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 17 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 65% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008, 46 Caucasian students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested and 90% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Asian student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 33 Caucasian students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. There were no students enrolled in 2008-10.
4. Melbourne Elementary – 6th Grade Benchmark – Literacy – Combined Population: In 2008, 45 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 43 students were tested and 86% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 51 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions in the three types of reading passages for 2008-2010 revealed that students scored 76.7% in multiple-choice and 63.0% in open-response. The average for the writing strands is 76.7%. Areas of concern for the three-year period are found in open response in Reading Content, 51.6%, and in Practical Reading, 66.2%. Areas of concern in the Writing portion of the benchmark are Content and Style, 67%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
    - R.9.6.6: Connect own background knowledge and personal experience to make inferences and to respond to new information presented in text
    - R.9.6.8: Analyze literary elements of character, plot, and setting
    - R.9.6.11: Use text information and background knowledge to draw conclusions and to make inferences (e.g., theme, etc.)
    - R.9.6.12: Identify main ideas and supporting evidence in short reading passages
    - R.9.6.13: Use the text features to locate and recall information, with emphasis on cue words and phrases
    - R.9.6.15: Classify and organize text information by determining subtopics of information
    - R.11.6.8: Explain the meaning of figurative language such as idioms, similes, and metaphors
    - W.6.6.6: Use knowledge of the parts of speech to construct effective sentences
    - o Common and proper nouns
    - o Pronouns to avoid repetition
    - o Active and linking verbs
    - o Adjectives to modify nouns and pronouns
    - o Adverbs to modify verbs, adjectives, and other adverbs
    - o Coordinate conjunctions to join
    - o Interjections to excite
    - o Prepositions to indicate relationships
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 4 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. The comparison of the multiple-choice and open-response revealed that students averaged scoring lower in open-response, 31.3%, than in multiple-choice, 52.1%. The writing average was 51.2%. Areas of concern are found in open response in Content and Practical Reading, 25.0%, and in Multiple-Choice Practical Reading, 43.8%. The areas of concern in the writing strand are Multiple-Choice Writing 43.8%, Content, 43.8%, and Style, 41.9%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 24 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 40 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008, all 45 students tested were Caucasian and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 43 Caucasian students were tested and 86% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 48 Caucasian students were tested and 83% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Hispanic, 1 Asian, and 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native student were tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. There were no LEP students in the school in 2008-2010.
  5. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 3 – Reading/Language - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 3 students were tested and 58.3% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 40 students were tested with a NPR of 40% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 32% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 47 students were tested and scored a NPR of 56% and a NPR of 30% in Comprehensive Language. Areas of concern are found in:
    - Informational Thinking Skills – Selecting an appropriate strategy (46.8%)
    - Functional Thinking Skills – Making inferences (44.7%)
    - Functional – Extended Meaning – (46.8%)
    - Informational Thinking Skills – Text characteristics (42.6%)
    - Informational Thinking Skills – Making Inferences (48.9%)
    - Literary Thinking Skills – Author factors and craft (55.3%)
    - Literary Thinking Skills – Making inferences (46.8%)
    - Literary Basic Understanding – Explicit sequence, actions (59.6%, 46.8%)
 Areas of Concern found in Comprehensive Language are:
    - Prewriting Strategies – Narrative Thinking Skills (36.2%)
    - Referencing – Narrative Basic Understanding (48.9%)
    - Revision – Narrative Thinking Skills (59.6%)

Content and Organization – Narrative Thinking Skills (23.4%) • Punctuation – Narrative Basic Understanding (34.0%, 31.9%) • Correct as is Narrative – Basic Understanding (59.6%) • Prewriting Strategies – Informative Thinking Skills (44.7%, 19.1%) • Revision – Informative Thinking Skills (44.7%, 40.4%, 51.1%) • Content and Organization – Informative Thinking Skills (38.3%, 44.7%) Usage – Informative Basic Understanding (55.3%) • Capitalization – Informative Basic Understanding (29.8%, 57.4%) Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students with disabilities were tested and scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 29% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 27% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 5 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 17% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 6% in Comprehensive Language. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 21 students were tested and 57.1% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 30% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 21% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 34 economically disadvantaged students were tested and scored a NPR of 55% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 32% in Comprehensive Language. Race and Ethnicity: In 2008, 34 Caucasian students were tested and 58.8% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 1 African American was tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, one Hispanic student was tested and scored a NPR of 9% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 17% in Comprehensive Language. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested with a NPR of 41% and a NPR of 32% in Comprehensive Language. One Hispanic student was tested in 2009 with a NPR of 9%. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and scored a NPR of 15% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 8% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and scored a NPR of 49% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 30% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 2 African American students were tested and scored a NPR of 76% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 41% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 43 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 56% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 30% in Comprehensive Language. There were no LEP students in 2008-2010.

Supporting  
Data:

6. Melbourne Elementary – Grade 4 – Reading/Language - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 44 students were tested and 65.9% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 41 students were tested with a NPR of 66% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 32% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 43 students were tested and scored a NPR of 63% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 24% in Comprehensive Language. Areas of concern in Reading Comprehension are found in: • Informational – Text characteristics (23.3%) • Informational – Extended Meaning (44.2%) • Functional – Explicit supporting details (44.2%) • Informational – Make inferences (46.5%) • Functional – Extended Meaning (55.8%) Areas of concern in Comprehensive Language are found in: • Content and Organization – Narrative Thinking Skills (16.3%, 39.5%) • Revision – Narrative Thinking Skills (58.1%) • Correct as is – Narrative Basic Understanding (55.8%, 48.8%) • Usage – Narrative Basic Understanding (51.2%) • Punctuation – Narrative Basic Understanding (30.2%) • Referencing – Informative Basic Understanding (51.2%, 41.9%) • Revising Informative Thinking Skills (55.8%, 44.2%, 34.9%) • Content and Organization – Informative Thinking Skills (46.5%, 58.1%, 55.8%) • Usage – Informative Basic Understanding (23.3%) Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 19% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 27% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 2 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 12% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 8% in Comprehensive Language. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, there were 27 economically disadvantaged students tested and 63% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 18 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 32% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 21% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 30 economically disadvantaged students were tested and scored a NPR of 55% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 19% in Comprehensive Language. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students tested during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, there were 39 Caucasian students tested and 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, one Hispanic student was tested and scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested with a NPR of 67% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 32% in Comprehensive Language. One African American student was tested with a NPR of 89%. One Hispanic student was tested in 2009 with a NPR of 7% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 17% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native was tested and scored a NPR of 32% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 9% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 42 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 63% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 24% in Comprehensive Language.
7. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 5 – Reading/Language - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 44 students were tested and 84% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 41 students were tested in Reading Comprehension with a NPR of 64% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 49% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 34 students were tested and scored a NPR of 67% in Reading Comprehension and 51% in Comprehensive Language. Areas of concern found in Reading Comprehension are: • Literary Thinking Skills – Author Factors and Craft (50.0%) • Informational – Using Monitoring Strategies (47.1%) • Literary – Author Factors and Craft (50.0%)

- Functional – Extended meaning in thinking skills (52.9%) • Functional – Using fix-up strategies (47.1%) Areas of concern found in Comprehensive Language are: • Content and Organization – Narrative Thinking Skills (58.5%, 55.9%) • Usage – Narrative Basic Understanding (31.7%) • Punctuation – Narrative Basic Understanding (48.3%) • Revision – Informative Thinking Skills (46.23.3%) • Content and Organization – Informative Thinking Skills (36.7%) • Capitalization – Informative Basic Understanding (38.2%) • Punctuation – Informative Basic Understanding (47.1% 52.9%) • Usage – Informative Basic Understanding (58.8%) Students with Disabilities: In 2007, 4 students with disabilities were tested and 25% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2008, 6 students with disabilities were tested and 33% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 2 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 41% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 27% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 3 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 2% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 5% in Comprehensive Language. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 25 students were tested and 80% scored above 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 25 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 61% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 61% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 17 economically disadvantaged students were tested and scored a NPR of 50% on Reading Comprehension and 34% on Comprehensive Language. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students tested during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, all 46 students tested were Caucasian and 84% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested with a NPR of 65% Reading Comprehension and 51% in Comprehensive Language. In 2009, one Asian/Pacific Islander was tested with a NPR of 27% and 24% in Comprehensive Language; one Hispanic student was tested with a NPR of 75% in Reading Comprehension and 20% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 33 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 70% in Reading Comprehension and 52% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and scored a NPR of 4% Reading Comprehension and 16% in Comprehensive Language.
8. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 6 – Reading/Language - SAT 10 -Combined Population: In 2008, 41 students were tested and 53.3% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 43 students were tested with a NPR of 57% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 65% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 51 students were tested and scored a NPR of 49% in Reading Comprehension and 53% in Comprehensive Language. Areas of concern for Reading Comprehension are found in: • Literary – Characteristics Thinking Skills (37.3%) • Functional – Using Fix-up Strategies (56.9%) • Informational – Informational Factors (43.1%) • Functional – Explicit Sequence, Actions (52.9%) • Informational – Selecting an Appropriate Strategy (54.9%) • Informational – Making Inferences (45.1%, 29.4%) • Informational – Using Monitoring Strategies (51.0%) • Informational – Extended Meaning (58.8%) Literary – Making Inferences (54.9%, 52.9%) • Literary – Extending Meaning (56.9%) Areas of concern for Comprehensive Language are found in: • Referencing – Narrative Basic Understanding (45.1%) • Revision – Narrative Thinking Skills (33.3%, 37.3%) • Correct as is – Narrative (58.8%) Capitalization – Narrative Basic Understanding (58.8%) • Punctuation – Narrative Basic Understanding (11.8%) • Referencing – Informative Basic Understanding (58.8%) • Revision – Informative Thinking Skills (51.0%, 56.9%) • Content and Organization – Informative Thinking Skills (27.5%, 52.9%) • Punctuation – Informative Basic Understanding (27.5%) Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 33.3% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 4 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 17% in Reading Comprehension and a NPR of 15% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 2 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 15% in Reading Comprehension and 23% in Comprehensive Language. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 45 students were tested and 53.3% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 54% Reading Comprehension and 61% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 40 economically disadvantaged students were tested and scored a NPR of 46% in Reading Comprehension and 50% Comprehensive Language. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school year. In 2008, all 45 students tested were Caucasian and 53.3% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, all 43 students tested were Caucasian with a NPR of 57% in Reading Comprehension and 65% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 48 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 50% in Reading Comprehension and 53% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and scored a NPR of 45% in Reading Comprehension and 70% Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and scored a NPR of 21% in Reading Comprehension and 39% in Comprehensive Language. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native was tested and scored a NPR of 45% in Reading Comprehension and 45% in Comprehensive Language.
9. Melbourne Elementary – Kindergarten – MAT 8 Reading - Combined Population: In 2009, 54 students were tested and 60% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 94 students were tested in Reading and 70% scored at or above the 50th percentile. The item analysis revealed an area of concern in Word Reading Meaning: Identify the printed word that is related to a given picture. An area of concern is found in Identification: Identify the printed word that names a given picture. Students with Disabilities: In 2009, 14 students with disabilities were tested and 36% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2010, 12 students with disabilities were tested and 50%

scored at or above the 50th percentile. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2009, 29 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 54% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2010, 63 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 64% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Race and LEP: In 2009, 53 Caucasian students were tested and 62% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2009, 1 African American student was tested and 0% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 90 Caucasian students were tested and 69% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 African American student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. There were no LEP students enrolled during 2008-2010 school.

10. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 1 – Reading - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 43 students were tested and 84% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 68% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2010, 56 students were tested and 55% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in:
  - Explicit Sequence, Actions: Identify explicit sequence (61%)
  - Interpretation-Process Cluster Making Inferences: Draw conclusions based on text (60%)
  - Extending Meaning: Apply ideas from text to new situations (61%)
  - Text Characteristics: Analyze text structure or elements (61%)
  - Functional Content Cluster Apply ideas from text to new situations (61%)
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 4 students with disabilities were tested and 75% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2009, 4 students with disabilities were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2010, 12 students with disabilities were tested and 18% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 19 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 79% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 27 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 59% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 42 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 51% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Race and LEP: In 2008, 1 Native American student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 42 Caucasian students were tested and 83% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested and 67% scored above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2009, 1 Native American student was tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile in. In 2010, 55 Caucasian students were tested and 56% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 African American student was tested and 0% scored at or above the 50th percentile. There were no LEP students enrolled in the district in 2008-2010.
11. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 2 – Reading - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 39 students were tested and 43.6% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2009, 38 students were tested and 37% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. In 2010, 39 students were tested and 53% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in:
  - Extended Meaning: Form hypothesis from ideas in text (46%)
  - Extended Meaning: Make predictions (57%)
  - Author Factors and Craft: Discern speaker's voice (52%)
  - Monitoring Strategies: Use graphics/illustration support/verify information (48%)
  - Fix-Up Strategies: Determine unknown words from context (46%)
  - Literary: Make predictions (57%)
  - Informational: Determine unknown words from context (46%)
  - Functional: Form hypothesis from ideas in text (46%)
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 20 students with disabilities were tested and 50% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2009, 20 students with disabilities were tested and 25% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2010, 21 students with disabilities were tested and 50% scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 34.8% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2009, 26 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 31% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2010, 27 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 50% scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, 38 Caucasian students were tested and 42.1% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2008, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2009, 36 Caucasian students were tested and 36% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. One Hispanic student was tested and 0% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, one Asian/Pacific Islander student was tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 38 Caucasian students were tested and 51% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile.
12. Melbourne Elementary School Attendance – AYP - Growth: In 2008, the attendance rate was 94.7%. In 2009, the attendance rate was 94.9%. In 2010, the attendance rate was 93.7%. The combined population of students was 86.1% proficient in Math, and 81.2% proficient in Literacy during 2008-2010. Growth was met by 79% of the students in literacy and 65% in Math in 2010. Melbourne Elementary met standards and the AYP status was "Achieving" for 2008-2010.

Goal To improve open response reading and writing skills in literacy across the curriculum with emphasis on the practical and content reading passages

Benchmark To meet state adequate yearly progress and to exceed the Melbourne Elementary 2008-2010 overall average of proficiency in literacy of 80% by 3% in 2011

Intervention: Align the literacy curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks:

Scientific Based Research: Jacobs, Heidi Hayes. (2004). Getting results with curriculum mapping. Alexandria: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN: The administration and counselors will participate in the Leadership Training offered by NAESC in order to disaggregate the school data, develop Academic Improvement Plans, determine AYP, and determine areas of strengths and weakness to evaluate the mapping. NAESC is offering this professional development training at Melbourne High School June 22-24, 2010. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 10/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>ALIGNMENT, ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN &amp; EVALUATION: The administrators will conduct staff development with the classroom teachers, resource teachers, and staff to disaggregate data to determine AIP, AYP, and areas of strengths and weaknesses in the mapping and alignment, while evaluating the ACSIP. This will help determine future staff development necessary. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Title Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>ALIGNMENT: Each teacher will align his/her curriculum mapping, both horizontally and vertically, for literacy in the individual classrooms and grades. The student learner expectations will appear in the daily lesson plans of the teachers. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>COLLABORATION: Teachers will meet with the Gifted &amp; Talented teacher, Special Education teachers, and the 504 coordinator to determine those students who require a more challenging curriculum acquired in GT, as well as those students requiring modifications in the Resource Room or classroom. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLANS: Teachers will participate in data analysis staff development of the 2010 Benchmark results in order to plan and devise the AIP's/IRI'S and enrichment/remediation process for the students scoring basic or below basic. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT: A committee made up of teachers, parents, and administrators will annually review the effectiveness of the reducing of class size as it relates to the student performances on the CRT and NRT. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
NEEDS ASSESSMENT/PLAN EVALUATION: Evaluation of the ACSIP will be an on-going process in order to meet the needs of the school and improve student academic performance. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
COLLABORATION: The Health/Wellness Committee will assist teachers and staff with meaningful activities that will serve to promote the learning process through physical activity and making healthy choices. Action Type: Wellness	Patty Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Staff Development for Melbourne School District for 2010-2011 includes: Power Point, Smart Classroom, Classroom Response System, etc. - 12 hours; Curriculum Development & Alignment, 12 hours; Instructional Strategies in Literacy, 6 hours; Health & Nutrition, Code of Ethics for Educators, and Parental Involvement - 6 Hours; Arkansas History - 2 hours; Through the Looking Glass - 6 hours; Are We Having Fun Yet - 6 hours; Off-campus professional development offerings for other instructional areas are subject to approval by the building administrator. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
Recommendations for strategies for RECRUITING AND MAINTAINING HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS have been addressed in the personnel handbook and will be reviewed annually. All of the elementary staff has been designated as HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTORS. The paraprofessionals meet the educational requirements of 2010-2011. Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
TRANSITION: Melbourne Elementary School works closely with the area preschools and headstarts in order to transition pre-school children into the public school in a positive manner. NAESC, Speech and Resource teachers, the preschool directors, administration, parents, and the Kindergarten teachers hold a conference on each child that is enrolling in the Kindergarten classes in the fall. Recommendations for individual instructional strategies are made at this time. Action Type: Collaboration	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

<p>Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Special Education                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>TRANSITION: Students and parents of the district 6th grade classes will be presented with the information on Smart Core and Common Core Curriculum choices for high school in order to make a more positive transition into grades 7-12. Melbourne School District parents and an administrator complete and sign the "Smart Core Informed Consent" form. Students transitioning to the 7th grade shall attend an orientation at the Melbourne High School in May, 2011, and again in August 2011.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Sandra Taylor,                  Counselor</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT plans for all the teachers will be based on the needs assessments for math and literacy and will be tied directly to the ACSIP. Principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, and all appropriate personnel will be included in planning and implementing the professional development for the Melbourne School District. Parent, student, and community input will be encouraged.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF STATE/LOCAL/FEDERAL FUNDS: The coordination and integration of all curriculum programs and services for math and literacy that are provided by the state, federal, or locally will be used to improve instruction for the students and increase student proficiency.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION: Teachers and staff will be provided with a variety of strategies to help close the gap between those students that are not yet proficient with those that have reached proficiency. These strategies , such as; DRA, DIBELS, STAR Math, small group tutoring, computer lab, individual tutoring, extended class time for math and literacy, after school tutoring, etc., will be used daily, or as needed, with those students to ensure student achievement is on track. These students, along with the parents and teachers, will devise a plan for improvement. They will be placed on a remediation plan until proficiency is met.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>Parents, students, and teachers are provided with a TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE COMPACT AGREEMENT, which is included in</p>	<p>Carolyn Blevins, Title I Coordinator</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Community</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>

<p>the student handbook, annually. This information is included in the packets for parents at the beginning of each school year.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>		06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leaders</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	
<p>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: The Title I Parent/Teacher Advisory Committee will meet in August to make recommendations on the math and literacy curriculum, specifically, with how Title I may supplement the program.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Danny Brightwell, Title I Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Professional Development plans for all the teachers will be based on the needs assessments for math and literacy and will be tied directly to the ACSIP. Principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, and all appropriate personnel will be included in planning and implementing the professional development for the Melbourne School District. Parent, student, and community input will be encouraged.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>ALIGNMENT: Teachers of grades K-6 have adopted the McGraw Hill basal reading series for classroom instruction. The readers, practice, and reinforcement materials have been correlated with the Arkansas Literacy Frameworks.</p> <p>Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT OR IRI: Melbourne Elementary teachers will meet with the parents of students requiring an IRI and AIP in 2010-2011. For those students, teachers and parents will meet during the first week of school to discuss the areas of weakness for the students and the options available for the remediation plan. Decisions will be made at this time by both the parent, students, and teachers as to the intervention methods to use to increase proficiency in literacy and math.</p> <p>Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>TITLE I INCLUSION IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Mrs. Loggains will meet with the faculty and staff to discuss the Title I Schoolwide Program in the Melbourne School District in August 2010. Teachers will be given a presentation of the requirements of Title I, how it will supplement the interventions and actions in the ACSIP, etc.</p> <p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Danny Brightwell, Title I Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

MELBOURNE ELEMENTARY – PROGRAM EVALUATION – Align the literacy curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks: The mapping/data analysis will be closely monitored as results of the CRT and NRT are made available. Teachers and administrators participate in staff development in the summer prior to school beginning. The purpose of the professional development is to analyze test results, make adjustments to the vertical and horizontal curriculum mapping, develop AIP's, and evaluate the interventions in the ACSIP. The long range objective is to reach 100% proficiency in both math and literacy. Success of the mapping and data analysis as it relates to instruction is measured by the increased number of proficient or advanced students in the district each year. The goal Melbourne Elementary has set for Literacy exceeds the state AYP. In 2010, Benchmark test results for the Combined Population for MES showed 81% proficient or advanced in literacy, compared to state AYP of 71.2% in K-5 & 67.6% in grade 6. The goal we have set for 2011 is to reach 90% proficiency. • In 2010, the data analysis for the benchmark revealed that students in the 3rd grade had 78% proficient or advanced in literacy. Areas of concern are Literary Reading, 58.7%, Content Reading, 47.1%, Practical Reading, 51.2%, and Multiple-Choice Practical Reading, 57.1%. Areas of concern in Writing are Style, 60%, Content, 61.3%, and Multiple-Choice Writing, 64.2%. • The fourth grade had 75% of its students scoring proficient or advanced. Areas of concern are found in open response in Content Reading, 50.8%, and Practical Reading, 55.0%. An area of concern in the Writing portion is found in Multiple-Choice Writing, 62.5%, and Style, 68.8%. • Fifth grade students showed 79% scoring proficient or advanced in literacy. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Content Reading, 58.3%, and Practical Reading, 57.9%. Areas of concern in Writing are Content and Style, 70.4%. • The sixth grade had 85% of the students scoring proficient or advanced in 2010. Areas of concern are found in open response in Reading Content, 51.6%, and in Practical Reading, 66.2%. Areas of concern in the Writing portion of the benchmark are Content and Style, 67%. • Kindergarten students had 70% of the students scoring at or above the 50th percentile in reading. Areas of concern were found in Word Meaning and Identification as it relates to identifying a picture and naming the word. • 55% of the 1st grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern were found in Sequencing, Inferring, Extended Meaning, Text Characteristics, and Content Clusters. • 53% of the 2nd grade

Lori Loggains,  
Principal

Start:  
07/01/2010  
End:  
06/30/2011

- District Staff
- Performance Assessments
- Teachers

ACTION BUDGET:

<p>students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Reading. Areas of concern are found in Author's Factor &amp; Craft in Voice, Extended Meaning by Making Predictions, Use Graphics to Support Information, and Determine Unknown Words from Context. • 56% of the 3rd grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile. 30% were at or above the 50th percentile in Comprehensive Language. Areas of concern are found in Making Inferences, Author's Factor &amp; Craft in Voice, Sequencing, and Extended Meaning. Areas of concern in Comprehensive Language are found in Prewriting Skills, Referencing, Revision, Content &amp; Organization, and Usage &amp; Capitalization. • 63% of the 4th grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile. 24% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Comprehensive Language. Areas of concern in reading are found in Extended Meaning, Making Inferences, Text Characteristics, and Supporting Details. Areas of concern in Comprehensive Language are found in Content and Organization, Usage, Punctuation, Referencing, and Revision. • 67% of the 5th grade students scored above the 50th percentile on the NRT in Reading and 51% in Comprehensive Language. Areas of concern are found in Author Factors and Craft, Using Monitoring Strategies, and Fix-Up Skills in Reading. Areas of concern in Comprehensive Language are found in Content and Organization, Usage, Punctuation, Revision, and Capitalization. • 49% of the 6th grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile on the NRT in Reading Comprehension and 53% in Comprehensive Language. Areas of Concern are found in Making Inferences, Selecting Appropriate Strategies, Extended Meaning, and Sequencing. Areas of concern in Comprehensive Language are found in Narrative and Informative Basic Understanding, Content and Organization, and Punctuation &amp; Usage. The literacy curriculum alignment and data analysis will continue to be implemented as designed. Melbourne Elementary will continue to develop the mapping and alignment program evaluations in accordance with ACT 807. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>COORDINATION OR FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL FUNDS: Title I funds allocated will be used to equip classroom with the component of a "Smart Classroom". Smart Boards, Classroom Response Systems, Projectors/Document Cameras, Wiring, etc. will be included in the classroom package for Smart Classrooms. The cost per room will be approximately \$2500. Nine rooms will</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Capital \$7200. Outlay: Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$1800. Title I -</p>

<p>receive the new equipment that will be utilized to incorporate technology in the existing Literacy Curriculum (Second Grade-2, First Grade-3, Kindergarten-4).                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				<p>Purchased Services: \$900.</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$99</p>
<p>PARENT AND STUDENT INFORMATIONAL PACKETS: Parents, students, and teachers are provided with a TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE COMPACT AGREEMENT, which is included in the student handbook. This information will also be included in the PARENT INFORMATIONAL PACKETS along with the procedure for submitting PARENT CONCERNS, and PTA/SIA information will be included. The packets include necessary information for parents at the beginning of each school year.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>ASSESSMENT/POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION: Target Assessment provided by NAESC will be utilized to evaluate students in literacy for grades 3-6. Students will participate in the Target Assessments at the end of each nine-weeks period. The principal and classroom teachers will analyze the scores to determine those students who are proficient and those who will require point-in-time remediation.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Each teacher and his/her principal will complete a professional development plan based on student proficiency on the benchmark testing for math, literacy, and science. To be included in the plan will be criteria for areas of weaknesses for the teacher in the subjects they must teach. Formal and informal teacher evaluations conducted by the principal, along with mapping &amp; alignment and data analysis, will be determining sources for professional development opportunities the teacher should select. Each teacher is required to complete a minimum of 60 hours professional development that ensures professional growth and has been approved by the campus administrator.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF FUNDS/TITLE I: A paraprofessional will be employed to assist the classroom teacher and special education teacher as they move the resource students toward proficiency in literacy. (FTE - 0.8)                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$5498.                  Title I - Employee Benefits: \$1190.</p>

<p>Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$66</p>
<p>PARENT/STUDENT/TEACHER TITLE I COMPACT: As set forth by the Melbourne School District Parental Involvement Plan the recommended roles of parents/guardians are as follows: Communicate with faculty and staff; Be active members in school activities and functions; Offer assistance to your children to ensure academic success. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENT/STUDENT/TEACHER COMPACT FOR TITLE I: As indicated by the Melbourne School District Parental Involvement Handbook, the recommended roles of students are as follows: Be active and engaged learners in the classroom and at home; Take responsibility for actions and education; Obey classroom and school rules Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENT/STUDENT/TEACHER COMPACT FOR TITLE I: As indicated in the Melbourne School District Parental Involvement Plan, The recommended roles of teachers are as follows: Effectively communicate with parents/guardians; Effectively communicate with students; Provide an open atmosphere for successful learning; Provide parents/guardians with up-to-date progress on student achievement and behavior; Attend professional growth opportunities. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES: Options for parents/guardians to become involved in school are as follows: Open House/Orientation; Parent/Teacher Conferences; "Bridging the Gap" Night; Volunteering; Tutors; Readers; Chaperones; Communication by Phone, E-Mail, District Website, Assignment Notebook, and Memos.  Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Community Leaders</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT: As a component of Informational Packets, parents will receive a copy of the Melbourne District Parental Involvement Plan. Included in the plan will be the Schoolwide Compact; Calendar of Parent Involvement Meetings by campus; Annual School Calendar which includes two parent/teacher conferences; Volunteer Resource Survey; Seminars offered for parents and students involved in</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>

<p>decision making; Information on the School Improvement Association and School Booster Club; Parent Facilitator Information for each campus; Student Handbook which contains information for the parents on developmentally appropriate learning activities in the home environment; Modes of communication with the teacher in order to better assist in the child's learning.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Parental Engagement                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT &amp; COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Money allocated in district plan to be used for professional development for 4 elementary teachers and Mrs. Loggains for the Literacy Lab. The registration cost is \$1300 per participant. Money allocated in Melbourne Elementary Plan will be for teachers to fulfill the obligation of \$1,000 worth of books for their classrooms.                      Action Type: Alignment                      Action Type: Professional Development</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$4000.</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$4000</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL FUNDS-IIA: Title I funds will be utilized to employ a teacher to reduce class size in 1st &amp; 2nd grades.                      Action Type: Alignment                      Action Type: Collaboration</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title II-A - Employee Salaries: \$19243.</p> <p>Title II-A - Employee Benefits: \$6414.</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$25657.</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF STATE/LOCAL/FEDERAL FUNDS-TITLE I: Money allocated will be to purchase 4 Writing Center for the Kindergarten classroom to supplement the literacy program. (4 x \$325)                      Action Type: Alignment                      Action Type: Technology Inclusion                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$1300.</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$1300</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF STATE/FEDERAL/LOCAL FUNDS-TITLE I: Money allocated will be to purchase a network printer for the Kindergarten Center as a supplement to the literacy curriculum.                      Action Type: Alignment                      Action Type: Technology Inclusion                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$600.</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$600</p>
<p>ACSIP APPROVAL: The 2010-2011 Melbourne Elementary ACSIP was approved by the board of directors on September 28, 2010.                      Action Type: Alignment                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	Gerald Cooper, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
Total Budget:				\$48145
Intervention: Implement ELLA (Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas):				

Scientific Based Research: National Reading Panel Report (2000), Strategies That Work (2000).				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Teachers will continue to attend staff development in the effective implementation of ELLA, the comprehensive literacy approach for literacy instruction. Year 1 teachers are scheduled to participate in staff development for ELLA in the summer of 2011. Action Type: Professional Development	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Classroom teachers and resource teachers of K-1 will implement ELLA, a comprehensive literacy approach, in their classroom curriculums to improve literacy skills. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: Teachers will inform parents quarterly of student progress in the comprehensive literacy instruction in ELLA. If a student is experiencing difficulty, it may be necessary to communicate more often. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
EQUITY, NEEDS ASSESSMENT, COLLABORATION, & ALIGNMENT: The elementary principal will monitor the level of implementation of ELLA in the classrooms by classroom walk-thru, teacher observations, disaggregation of the data from the CRT and NRT, DRA and DIBELS assessments, etc. The teacher will then have a conference with the principal to discuss the observations and data analysis. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
NEEDS ASSESSMENT & PROGRAM EVALUATION: Melbourne Elementary School will administer the following assessments to evaluate the impact of ELLA on student learning: DRA K-2 and 3-4 for on level reading instruction; DIBELS for word fluency; the NRT - MAT8 will be the outcome assessment for reading comprehension; pre and post testing will be used; additional diagnostic tests will be given throughout 2010-11. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION & AIP/IRI: Students identified as not meeting learner expectations (proficient or advanced) as set forth by the Arkansas Frameworks will receive additional literacy strategy instruction in after-school tutoring and small group instruction. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
NEEDS ASSESSMENT & AIP/IRI: The ELLA program will be evaluated and success will be determined by the increase in the number of students meeting proficiency at the end of Kindergarten and First Grade Benchmarks on the Arkansas Literacy Frameworks. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
The HEALTH/WELLNESS Committee for Melbourne School District give recommendations of activities to be used in	Patti Smith, School	Start: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> </ul>	

the classroom that promote health and wellness of the children and best serve their needs in accordance with the District Wellness Policy. Action Type: Wellness	Nurse	End: 06/30/2011		ACTION BUDGET
PROGRAM EVALUATION: Melbourne Elementary School has been working toward 100% of the faculty being trained in ELLA and Effective Literacy since as early as 2000. These programs are offered through Arkansas Department of Education by the literacy specialists. Elementary teachers are required to go through the training for the two programs, which, according to the research, are effective intervention programs that are aligned with the Arkansas Literacy Frameworks. According to the available data, one student was tested in the 1st grade in 2006-2007 and scored in the 42nd percentile. In 2007-2008, 12 students were involved in ELLA and 91.7% scored above the 50th percentile in the 1st grade on the STAR Reading Assessment. In 2008-2009, 40 students were tested and 63% scored above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2010, 56 students were tested and 55% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in: • Explicit Sequence, Actions: Identify explicit sequence (61%) • Interpretation-Process Cluster Making Inferences: Draw conclusions based on text (60%) • Extending Meaning: Apply ideas from text to new situations (61%) • Text Characteristics: Analyze text structure or elements (61%) • Functional Content Cluster: Apply ideas from text to new situations (61%) Other methods of evaluation for the program are classroom grades, portfolio assessments, and teacher observation. Since students in grades K-1 seem to be making gains toward proficiency, the ELLA Program will continue to be implemented as designed. Melbourne Elementary will continue to develop the Program Evaluations according to ACT 807. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET

Total Budget:

Intervention: Implement Accelerated Reader:

Scientific Based Research: Renaissance Learning: Educational Research Department. (2001). Arkansas school sees schoolwide improvements in reading achievement. Retrieved October 14, 2002, from Renaissance Learning Web site: <http://research.renlearn.com>.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT & INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Classroom teachers and resource teachers, will participate in training for the effective implementation of Accelerated Reader in the classroom and resource room to improve literacy skills. Accelerated Reader will be implemented in the classrooms, K-6, as a supplement to the adopted reading series. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT & COLLABORATION: Parents/Guardians will be informed of the components of the Accelerated Reader Program	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

<p>(goals set for students, progress tracking for students, etc.) through "Principal's Notes" taken home by students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>		06/30/2011		
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENTS: Teachers use Target Testing as a diagnostic component and implement Accelerated Reader to enhance literacy skill development and comprehension in students by using computer-based applications. Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Melissia Cooper, Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT &amp; EVALUATION: Parents are involved in the Accelerated Reader program through an advisory capacity and also as a resource in encouraging the students to participate in more reading and evaluating the program. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>EQUITY &amp; NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Teachers assess the effectiveness of the Accelerated Reader program by comparing increased scores of proficient or advanced on the Benchmark or NRT. Special attention is given to discrepancies in reading abilities of male vs. female, economically disadvantaged vs. non-economically disadvantaged, and disabled students vs. non-disabled students when data analysis is completed in the fall. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>COLLABORATION: The HEALTH/WELLNESS Committee will meet with the administration and classroom teachers to make suggestions for activities that shall be implemented in the classrooms to promote the health and wellness of each student. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness</p>	Patti Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: Melbourne Elementary began the Accelerated Reader program as early as 1999. Students are given the rules developed by the committee of the AR program, assigned a goal that is age/ability appropriate, and their goal attainment is monitored every month at the time the AR Committee meets. Students read and take tests and their points accumulate. All students reaching their AR goal at the end of the year win a special field trip prize. The number and percentage of the students attaining their goal is determined at the end of the year by the AR committee and Mrs. Loggains. Mrs. Cooper, Library Media Specialist, monitors the AR program weekly and the classroom teachers monitor it daily. Students are allowed to take tests on books in the classroom or the library and a teacher must be present. Comparisons are then made to the previous years. The percentage of students reaching the AR goal has increased each year</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School Library</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

since the program began. Approximately 50% of the entire elementary student body reached their AR goal in 2010. Our goal is to reach 100%. Benchmark assessments showed an increased percentage of advanced and proficient students in K-6 for 2010. Proficiency in literacy for 2010 ranged from 75%-85% proficient or advanced for the combined populations in grades 3-6. The three-year data average for 2008-2010 is 80% proficient in literacy. The Program Evaluations will continue to be developed according to ACT 807. Action Type: Program Evaluation				
COLLABORATION: The library media specialist will invite visiting authors to the school for assembly time. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Melissa Cooper, Library Media Specialist	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● School Library</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
TITLE I COORDINATION OF STATE/LOCAL/FEDERAL FUNDS: Money allocated will be used to purchase software license for the Accelerated Reader program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School Library</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title I - Purchased \$1000. Services:  ACTION BUDGET: \$10
COORDINATION OF STATE/FEDERAL/LOCAL FUNDS: TITLE I: Money allocated will be used for classroom sets of books for the Accelerated Reader Program. Each classroom teacher will be allotted \$300. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School Library</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$5400.  ACTION BUDGET: \$54
COORDINATION OF FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL FUNDS-TITLE I: Money allocated will be utilized to purchase a network printer and computer for the Library to supplement the Accelerated Reader program (Woods & Cooper). Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$1000. Title I - Capital Outlay: \$1900.  ACTION BUDGET: \$29
Total Budget:				\$9:

Intervention: Implement Effective Literacy (Grades 2-4):

Scientific Based Research: National Reading Panel Report (2000), Strategies That Work (2000).

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Teachers of grades 2-4 will continue to participate in the required staff development for Effective Literacy. Newly hired personnel will participate in the staff development in the summer of 2011. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Melbourne Elementary School will	Lori Loggains,	Start: 07/01/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	

continue to implement the comprehensive literacy approach in Effective Literacy in grades 2-4 by providing instruction in the core reading program as designed by the Effective Literacy program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Principal	End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
EVALUATION/NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Mrs. Loggains will monitor, confer with, and evaluate the teachers on the level of implementation of Effective Literacy in the classrooms by classroom walk-thru and teacher evaluation sessions. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: Parents will be informed of student progress in Effective Literacy in all components of the literacy frameworks expectations. A list of suggested activities will also be provided to the parents and their participation will be encouraged. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
EQUITY, NEEDS ASSESSMENT, AIP/IRI, POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION: Students identified through DIBELS, DRA, CRT, and NRT as not meeting expectations for success will receive additional literacy instruction in small groups and tutoring services provided by the school. Progress will be monitored bi-weekly until expectations are met. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Equity	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM: Melbourne Elementary will administer assessments, such as Developmental Reading Assessment for placement; DIBELS Word Fluency for vocabulary, fluency, etc.; the CRT - Arkansas Benchmark will be the outcome assessment for literacy for 3-8; NRT - SAT10 will be the outcome assessment for reading comprehension in 1-2 and MAT 8 for Kindergarten. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
COLLABORATION & IMPLEMENTATION/COORDINATION OF FUNDS: Title I Funds will be utilized for a 2nd grade classroom set of "Phonetic Connections", a component of the Effective Literacy Program. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title I - Materials \$1300. & Supplies:  ACTION BUDGET: \$13
COLLABORATION: The WELLNESS Committee will suggest activities to use to promote the health and wellness of each student in the literacy classes and therefore be conducive to learning. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Patti Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
PROGRAM EVALUATION: Melbourne Elementary School has been working toward 100% of the faculty being trained in ELLA and Effective Literacy as early as 2000. These programs were offered through the Arkansas Department of	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

Education through the local educational cooperatives. Elementary teachers are required to go through the training for the two programs, which, according to the research, are effective intervention programs that are aligned with the Arkansas Literacy Frameworks. Available data began in 2006-2007 for Effective Literacy in grades 2-4. The STAR Reading assessment was used and 12-2nd grade students were in the program in 2006-2007 with 91.7% scoring above 50th percentile. 24-3rd grade students were involved in the program with 75% scoring above the 50th percentile. 26 of the 4th grade students were in the program and 53.9% scored above the 50th percentile. During 2007-2008, the data revealed that students in 2nd grade had 87% of 37 students scoring above the 50th percentile; 32 students in the 3rd grade participated and 60% scored above the 50th percentile; 29 students in the 4th grade participated and 51.7% scored above the 50th percentile. Data for 2008-2009 revealed 38 students were tested and 37% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2010, data for the CRT and NRT reveal that students in these grades continue to increase in proficiency. In 2010, 39 students were tested and 53% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in:

- Extended Meaning: Form hypothesis from ideas in text (46%)
- Extended Meaning: Make predictions (57%)
- Author Factors and Craft: Discern speaker's voice (52%)
- Monitoring Strategies: Use graphics/illustrations to support/verify information (48%)
- Fix-Up Strategies: Determine unknown words from context (46%)
- Literary: Make predictions (57%)
- Informational: Determine unknown words from context (46%)
- Functional: Form hypothesis from ideas in text (46%)

In 2010, 47 students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. Areas of concern for the three-year data are found in open response for Literary Reading, 58.7%, Content Reading, 47.1%, Practical Reading, 51.2%, and Multiple-Choice Practical Reading, 57.1%. Areas of concern in Writing are Style, 60%, Content, 61.3%, and Multiple-Choice Writing, 64.2%.

- R.9.3.7: Comprehension: Ask questions and support answers by connecting prior knowledge with literal and inferential information found in the text
- R.9.3.9: Comprehension: Draw inferences, such as conclusions or generalizations, and support them with text evidence and/or personal experiences
- R.9.3.10: Determining importance to make meaning: Organize information and events logically

In 2010, 43 students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. Areas of concern for the three-year data are found in open response in Content Reading, 50.8%, and Practical Reading, 55.0%.

- R.11.4.1: Use context clues to determine the precise meaning of new words
- R.9.4.1: Organize prior knowledge and new information to make meaning of the text
- R.9.4.2: Make connections that demonstrate a deeper understanding of text related to self, text,

<p>and/or world • R.9.4.5: Generate questions that reflect active engagement in the text • R.9.4.6: Use additional resources to support answers to questions formulated before, during, and after reading. Long range test results that are seen in the 5th grade after students have been in the program for two years reveal that scores increased from 4th to 5th grade with 58% of the students scoring above the 50th percentile on the STAR assessment. Other methods of evaluation for the program are classroom grades, portfolio assessments, teacher observation, Effective Literacy Data. Since students seem to be making gains toward proficiency, the Effective Literacy Program will continue to be implemented as designed. The Program Evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Title I money to be spent for professional development for Bridget Cooper in training for Effective Literacy. Professional Development money has been allocated in the Melbourne School District Plan. The hours will be above the 60 required staff development hours. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$1:</p>
<p>Intervention: Implement IMPACT Learning Lab:</p>				
<p>Scientific Based Research: "Making Standards Work", Doug Reeves, 2000.</p>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>TECHNOLOGY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Teachers will participate in 6 hours of technology staff development for Content Standard Projected Assessments to integrate into the IMPACT computer learning center. The computer curriculum will be aligned with the Arkansas Frameworks and will supplement the school curriculum for literacy. Personnel will be hired to fill this position and the salary and benefits will be funded by Title I. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF FUNDS: TITLE I FUNDS will be utilized to employ a full-time aide who has completed and passed the "Para Pro Assessment", Mrs. Faye McSpadden (FTE - 1.0), for the Impact Lab. The IMPACT learning center will assist teachers in remediation and enrichment of all students in further developing their literacy skills, improve proficiency on the CRT and NRT, and will help alleviate discrepancies in male/female, IEP/General Ed, Economically Disadvantaged/Non-Economically Disadvantaged literacy scores. Action Type: Equity</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee \$7215. Salaries: Title I - Employee \$2348. Benefits:  ACTION BUDGET: \$95</p>

Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
NEEDS ASSESSMENT PLAN EVALUATION of the IMPACT learning center will be on-going using Target Testing, teacher assessments and observations. Increase in proficiency on the Benchmark for grades 3-8 and the DIBELS and DRA assessments for K-2 will be the measuring tool for the effectiveness of the learning center. Proficiency in literacy for 2010 ranged from 75%-85% proficient or advanced for the combined populations in grades 3-6. The three-year data average for 2008-2010 is 80% proficient in literacy. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: Parents/guardians will be informed of the IMPACT learning center and the expectations during the Open House, through correspondence sent home with students, and through the Annual Report published in the local paper. Classroom teachers will keep parents advised of progress made in IMPACT Lab through notes, progress reports sent monthly, or phone calls. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Teachers will utilize technology across the curriculum to increase achievement of students in areas of "Writing Across the Curriculum" and Literacy in Content. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
COLLABORATION: The WELLNESS committee will consult with the principal and teachers and make suggestions of activities that will promote learning and the health and wellness of each student in the literacy classroom. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Patti Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
PROGRAM EVALUATION: Melbourne School District began the Impact Computer Lab approximately 10 years ago. The district received the lab through a grant. The software that has been made available is to supplement the regular classroom curriculum in math, science, and literacy. Students work on objectives that have been designated by the classroom teacher. At the end of each assignment, students and teachers receive immediate assessment feedback on whether the child is proficient or not yet proficient. Those not yet proficient will receive remediation from the teacher and will be assigned more activities to help the child reach proficiency. Progress reports are sent home to the parents quarterly. Evidence of success of the program is seen in the results of the pre and post tests, students' daily grades, learning lab assessments of the	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

objectives, and on the annual benchmark assessments for grades 3-6. In 2010, the data analysis of the benchmark revealed that students of the 3rd grade had 78% scoring advanced or proficient. Areas of concern are found in open response for Literary Reading, 58.7%, Content Reading, 47.1%, Practical Reading, 51.2%, and Multiple-Choice Practical Reading, 57.1%. Areas of concern in Writing are Style, 60%, Content, 61.3%, and Multiple-Choice Writing, 64.2%. Students of 4th grade had an average of 75% scoring proficient or advanced in literacy. Areas of concern for the three-year data are found in open response in Content Reading, 50.8%, and Practical Reading, 55.0%. An area of concern in the Writing portion is found in Multiple-Choice Writing, 62.5%, and Style, 68.8%. Students of 5th grade had an average of 79% proficient or advanced in literacy in 2010. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Content Reading, 58.3%, and Practical Reading, 57.9%. Areas of concern in Writing are Content and Style, 70.4%. Students of 6th grade had an average of 85% scoring proficient or advanced in literacy. Areas of concern for the three-year data are found in open response in Reading Content, 51.6%, and in Practical Reading, 66.2%. Areas of concern in the Writing portion of the benchmark are Content and Style, 67%. Teachers will give the Lab Manager the Student Learner Expectations each child needs to master. Once the child masters the particular SLE, he/she is allowed to move forward. The Impact program will continue to be implemented as designed. The program evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807.  
 Action Type: Equity  
 Action Type: Parental Engagement  
 Action Type: Program Evaluation  
 Action Type: Technology Inclusion

Total Budget:	\$9!
---------------	------

**Intervention: Implement After-School Tutoring Program:**

Scientific Based Research: Hofferth, S. L., & Jankuniene, Z. (2001). Life after school. Educational Leadership, 58(7), 19-23.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p><b>ALIGNMENT &amp; INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS:</b> Teachers and parents will develop an after-school tutoring program to supplement the literacy curriculum to mentor all students in need of extra help to reach or maintain proficiency. The tutoring program will be aligned with the Arkansas Frameworks.                      Action Type: Equity                      Action Type: Parental Engagement                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p><b>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION &amp; EQUITY:</b> All students scoring basic or below basic or requiring additional help in the classroom will participate in small group instruction for remediation or enrichment on the literacy skills in which they are not yet proficient or just need a stronger foundation. Emphasis will continue to be on responding to</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET

<p>open response questions, particularly in Content Reading, comprehension, analyzing, etc.                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Special Education                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS &amp; NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Certified teachers will be employed to conduct the after-school tutoring program and evaluate the effectiveness of the program based on classroom grades, CRT and NRT data, DRA and DIBELS assessments, etc.                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Elementary                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET</p>
<p>COLLABORATION: The HEALTH AND WELLNESS Committee will offer suggestions to teachers of physical activities that may be implemented in the after school tutoring program that will enhance the learning in the regular classroom.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Patti Smith,                  School                  Nurse</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET</p>
<p>COLLABORATION/HIGHLY QUALIFIED: Extended day tutoring for math and literacy will be provided for the students through district funded programs and supplemented by NSLA. This after school tutoring will be coordinated by Lori Loggains and taught by members of the certified staff of Melbourne Elementary School.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: After School Tutoring began as an intervention for students in need of math and literacy intervention and expanded into a program that allowed all students who were interested to participate. The program data collection began in 02-03. The after school tutoring began in 03-04 with certified teachers conducting it. The after school enrichment teachers collaborate with the classroom teachers on student learner expectations and the Arkansas Frameworks for Math and Literacy, progress of the learner by monitoring daily classroom performance in math, Star Math Assessments conducted quarterly and the CRT/NRT, which is an annual assessment. Proficiency in literacy for 2010 ranged from 75%-85% proficient or advanced for the combined populations in grades 3-6. The three-year data average for 2008-2010 is 80% proficient in literacy. The goal is to exceed 80% proficiency by 3% in 2011. Areas of concern are found in: Open Response with an overall average for 3-6 Literacy of 58.2% for 08-10. Data shows that students in grades 3-6 averaged scoring the following in open response: Content Reading, 51.9%, Literary Reading, 65.2 %, and Practical Reading, 57.6%. The SAT 10 results show needed improvement in the following areas: 1st Grade-Explicit Sequence, Actions: Identify explicit sequence (61%) • Interpretation-Process Cluster Making Inferences: Draw conclusions based on text (60%) • Extending Meaning: Apply ideas from text to new situations (61%) • Text Characteristics: Analyze text structure or elements (61%) • Functional Content Cluster: Apply ideas from text to new situations (61%): 2nd Grade: Extended Meaning: Form hypothesis from ideas in text (46%) • Extended Meaning: Make predictions (57%) • Author Factors and Craft: Discern speaker's voice (52%) • Monitoring Strategies: Use</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET</p>

<p>graphics/illustrations to support/verify information (48%) • Fix-Up Strategies: Determine unknown words from context (46%) • Literary: Make predictions (57%) • Informational: Determine unknown words from context (46%) • Functional: Form hypothesis from ideas in text (46%) 3rdGrade: Informational Thinking Skills - Selecting an appropriate strategy (46.8%) • Functional Thinking Skills – Making inferences (44.7%) • Functional – Extended Meaning – (46.8%) • Informational Thinking Skills – Text characteristics (42.6%) • Informational Thinking Skills – Making Inferences (48.9%) • Literary Thinking Skills – Author factors and craft (55.3%) • Literary Thinking Skills – Making inferences (46.8%) • Literary Basic Understanding – Explicit sequence, actions (59.6%, 46.8%) 4thGrade: Informational – Text characteristics (23.3%) • Informational – Extended Meaning (44.2%) • Functional – Explicit supporting details (44.2%) • Informational – Making inferences (46.5%) • Functional – Extended Meaning (55.8%) Teachers administer pre and post standardized tests that are components of the reading series, and they keep an on-going record of the assessment results taken throughout the year to use as an evaluation for the student and the program. Questionnaires collected by Mrs. Loggains concerning the after school programs are compiled and reviewed annually. These questionnaires reveal the parents score the program as being proficient in helping students with problem areas. The program evaluation will continue to be developed and implemented according to ACT 807. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Total Budget:

Intervention: Implement Technology-Based Smart Classrooms:

Scientific Based Research: S.K.S. Gupta, W. Lee, A. Purukayastha, and P.Srimani. (editorial). IEEE Personal Communications, Special Issue on Pervasive Computing, August 2001, Vol. 8, No. 4. pp. 8-9.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION/ALIGNMENT: Melbourne Elementary School will implement the Smart Classroom to supplement the existing literacy curriculum and will be aligned with the Arkansas Frameworks. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION/ALIGNMENT: The "Smart Classroom" design for Melbourne Elementary Campus will includes equipment for approximately 8 classrooms. Items included are: Epson Projector, Mount Box, Cable &amp; Wiring, Faceplate, Universal Plate &amp; Mount, Presentation Remote, Document Camera, Wireless Slate, Surge Protector, etc. The estimated cost of each classroom is \$2,500.00 Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: The Melbourne School District was allotted stimulus money. Mr. Cooper organized a committee, whose</p>	<p>Gerald Cooper, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>

<p>primary purpose was to determine the area of greatest need for the district. The committee consisted of all members of the administration, school board representative, parent/community representative, standards review administrator, members of the faculty and staff, and the technology coordinator. The outcome of the meeting was to first send a questionnaire to the entire faculty to determine their top 5 needs for their classrooms. Mrs. Hoskinds then asked them to number the needs from greatest to least. Teachers were also to supply the rationale for the needs. She then organized the surveys and completed charts for the committee to view and discuss. According to the surveys, it was determined that the area the majority of the teachers requested was technology in the classroom. Mrs. Hoskinds then wrote a proposal featuring all the components of the technology equipment needs of the teachers. The committee then discussed the contents of the proposal and determined that the "Smart Classroom" would be the most beneficial equipment to implement at this time. The "Smart Classroom" will be implemented in Mt. Pleasant Elementary, Melbourne Elementary, and Melbourne High School during 2009-1011. The primary purpose of the "Smart Classroom" is to enhance and supplement the Literacy, Math, and Science Curriculums with technology as set forth by the Arkansas Department of Education Frameworks. The benchmark results will serve as the program evaluation according to ACT 807. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>		06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consultants</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT/TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION: Parents will be invited to attend an open house on August 17, 2010. This will give them the opportunity to visit the Smart Classrooms. Teachers will demonstrate the use of the equipment and give an overview of how it will be utilized to supplement the Literacy, Math, Social Studies, and Science Curriculum. Teachers will show parents how technology ties in with the Arkansas Frameworks by referring to goals, student learner expectations, assessment requirements, etc. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT/TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION/COLLABORATION: Teachers and staff will participate in a minimum of 6 hours staff development focusing primarily on proper usage of the equipment purchased for the Smart Classrooms. Staff Development for technology has been scheduled for July 29-30, 2010, on the Melbourne High School Campus. LeeAnna Hoskinds, NAESC Technology Coordinator for Melbourne School</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

<p>District, will be the instructor.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
<p>TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION/EQUITY/SPECIAL EDUCATION: The remaining classroom teachers of the district will have components of a "Smart Classroom" installed. All students will benefit in the supplemental instructional strategies provided through technology inclusion. In Literacy, the equipment will be used to provide students with alternative instruction in writing. Classroom teachers and resource teachers will be able to model proficient and advanced writing prompts for the students more effectively by using the projectors and writing tablets. Literacy scores should increase on open response on the literacy benchmark.                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Special Education                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PLAN ASSESSMENT/ALIGNMENT/COLLABORATION: The effectiveness of the supplemental equipment of the Smart Classrooms and other technological equipment purchased will be assessed by the committee members through Data Analysis of the Benchmark results for Literacy.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>COLLABORATION/WELLNESS: The wellness committee will meet with the teachers and make suggestions of activities that will promote learning and the health and wellness of each student in the literacy classroom.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Patti Smith, School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>SCHOOLWIDE ASSESSMENT-COORDINATION OF STATE/FEDERAL/LOCAL FUNDS: Melbourne Elementary School will purchase updates for Heart Beeps, a curriculum-based software for Formative and Summative Assessment in Language Arts and Math. This assessment will be used to provide useful feedback that will determine areas in need of adjustments in instructional strategies for the individual students. The cost for the Heart Beeps license is \$3,000.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  Title I -                  Purchased \$1500.                  Services:                  _____                  ACTION BUDGET:       \$15</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL FUNDS-TITLE I: Money allocated will be utilized to purchase Netbooks for each classroom teacher of Melbourne Elementary to supplement the literacy curriculum. (28 x \$700)</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  Title I -                  Materials \$19600.                  &amp;                  Supplies:                  _____</p>

Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET: \$196
COORDINATION OF STATE/FEDERAL/LOCAL FUNDS-TITLE I: Money allocated will be to purchase Netbook Mobile-Cart & Accessories.	LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011		Title I - Materials & Supplies: \$3500.  ACTION BUDGET: \$3500
COORDINATION OF FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL FUNDS-TITLE VI: Approximately 22 Ipad will be purchased for Melbourne Elementary School and will be used to incorporate technology in the literacy and math classrooms. Materials to be purchased are: 18 3G 32 GB Ipad @ \$730 = \$13,140.00; 18 Otterbox @ \$100 = \$1,800; 1 Cart @ \$2,500; 18 Applications @ \$250 = \$4,500; Accessories, \$180. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	Title VI State - Capital Outlay: \$1250. Title VI State - Materials & Supplies: \$9810.  ACTION BUDGET: \$11060
Total Budget:				\$35060

Priority 2: To Improve Math Skills with emphasis on open response in Geometry, Data Analysis, Measurement, Number and Operations, and Algebra:

- Melbourne Elementary - Benchmark – Grade 3 – Mathematics – Combined Population: In 2008, 36 students were tested and 97% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 47 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions for 2008-10 revealed that students scored lower in open response, 56.7%, than in multiple-choice, 70%. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Geometry, 42.1%, Measurement, 52.1%, and Number Sense and Operations, 55.8%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
  - G.8.3.1: Students shall analyze characteristics and properties of 2 and 3 dimensional geometric shapes and develop mathematical arguments about geometric relationships: Compare, contrast and build 3-D solids by investigating the number of faces, edges, and vertices on models
  - G.8.3.2: Identify regular polygons with at least 4 sides (square, pentagon, hexagon and octagon)
  - G.8.3.4: Students shall analyze characteristics and properties of 2 and 3 dimensional geometric shapes and develop mathematical arguments about geometric relationships: Identify and draw intersecting and parallel lines
  - M.12.3.4: Students shall use attributes of measurement to describe and compare mathematical and real-world objects: Demonstrate the relationship among different standard units Length: 12 in = 1 ft, 3 ft = 1 yd, 36 in = 1 yd: Capacity: 2 cups = 1 pint, 2 pints = 1 quart, 4 quarts = 1 gallon: Weight: 16 ounces = 1 lb
  - M.13.3.10: Find the perimeter of a figure by measuring the length of the sides: Students shall identify and use units, systems and processes of measurement
  - A.4.3.2: Relate skip counting patterns to multiplication
  - NO.3.3.4: Solve simple problems using operation involving addition and subtraction using a variety of methods and tools (e.g., objects, mental computation, paper and pencil and with and without appropriate technology): Students shall compute fluently and make reasonable estimates
  - DAP.15.3.1: Read and interpret pictographs and bar graphs in which symbols or intervals are greater than one: Students shall select and use appropriate statistical methods to analyze data
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students were tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 5 students with disabilities were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. Areas of concern for the three-year data averages are found in open response in Geometry, 6.3%, Measurement, 37.5%, and in Multiple-Choice in Measurement, 35.7%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 21 students were tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 78% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 34 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 91% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008, 34 Caucasian students were tested and 97% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, one African American was tested and scored proficient or advanced. Also in 2008, one Hispanic student was tested and scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Hispanic student was tested and

- 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 43 Caucasian students were tested and 88% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 2 African American students were tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. There were no LEP students enrolled in the district in 2008-2010.
2. Melbourne Elementary – Benchmark – Grade 4 - Mathematics – Combined Population: In 2008, 41 students were tested and 81% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 41 students were tested and 85% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 43 students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the 2008-10 test data revealed that students scored lower in open-response, 56.0%, than in multiple-choice, 72.7%. Areas of concern for the three-year data include Geometry open-response, 45.0%, Measurement, 56.3%, and Data Analysis open-response, 58.3%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
    - M.13.4.10: Use strategies for finding the area of a rectangle
    - DAP.17.4.1: Use fractions to predict probability of an event
    - G.8.4.3: Identify, draw, and describe a line, line segment, a ray, an angle, intersecting, perpendicular, and parallel lines
    - NO.1.4.2: Use the place-value structure of the base-ten number system and be able to represent and compare whole numbers to millions (using models, illustrations, symbols, expanded notation and problem solving)
    - NO.2.4.4: Represent and explain division as measurement and division including equal groups, related rates, price, rectangular arrays (area model), combinations and multiplicative comparison See Appendix for more details
    - NO.3.4.1: Demonstrate, with and without appropriate technology, computational fluency in multi-digit addition and subtraction in contextual problems
    - A.4.4.3: Determine the relationship between sets of numbers by selecting the rule (2 step rule in words)
    - A.5.4.2: Express mathematical relationships using simple equations and inequalities ( $>$ ,  $<$ ,  $=$ ,  $\neq$ ) Ex.  $4 \times 5$  \_\_\_\_\_  $8 \times 2 + 3$
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the test data for 2008-2010 revealed that students with disabilities scored lower on open-response, 21.3%, than in multiple-choice, 49.5%. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open-response in Geometry, 6.3%, Number Sense, 18.8%, Measurement & Data Analysis, 25%, and Algebra, 31.3%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 27 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 18 students with disabilities were tested and 83% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 3 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 73% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008, 31 of the students tested were Caucasian and 80% scored proficient or advanced. There was 1 Asian/Pacific Islander tested and scored proficient or advanced. Also, in 2008, there was 1 Hispanic tested and scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38 Caucasian students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 African American student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Native American student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 42 Caucasian students were tested and 80% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. There were no LEP students enrolled in the district in 2008-2010.
  3. Melbourne Elementary – Benchmark – Grade 5 – Math – Combined Population: In 2008, 46 students were tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 41 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 34 students were tested and 91% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the 2008-2010 test data revealed that students scored lower in open response, 52.7%, than in multiple-choice, 70.4%. Areas of concern for the three-year data include Open Response, 43.7%, and Multiple-Choice, 56.7%, in Measurement, Open Response in Algebra, 52.5%, Number Sense, 57.1%, Data Analysis, 43.7%, and Geometry, 57.0%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
    - M.12.5.4: Understand when to use linear units to describe perimeter, square units to describe area or surface area, and cubic units to describe volume in real world situations
    - NO.1.5.5: Use models of benchmark fractions and their equivalent forms
    - NO.1.5.6: Use models to differentiate between perfect squares up to 100 and other numbers
    - A.5.5.2: Write expressions containing one variable (a letter representing an unknown quantity) and use rules for addition and subtraction
    - A.4.5.2: Interpret and write a rule for a one-operation function (Ex: adding 3)
    - G.8.5.1: Identify and model regular and irregular polygons including decagon
    - G.10.5.1: Use geometric vocabulary (horizontal/x-axis, vertical/y-axis, ordered pairs) to describe location and plot points in Quadrant I
    - G.11.5.1: Using grid paper, draw and identify two-dimensional patterns (nets) for cubes
    - M.12.5.4: Understand when to use linear units to describe perimeter, square units to describe area or surface area, and cubic units to describe volume, in real world situations
    - DAP.15.5.1: Interpret graphs such as line graphs, double bar graphs, and circle graphs
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 6 students with disabilities were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. The analysis of the test data for 2008-10 reveals that students with disabilities scored lower on open response, 25.0%, than in multiple-choice, 45.1%. Areas of concern for the three-year data averages are four in open response in Geometry, 12.5%, Measurement & Algebra, 31.3%, Data Analysis and Number

Sense, 25%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 25 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 84% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 25 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 44% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 17 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 82% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008, there were 46 Caucasian students tested and 87% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Asian student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 33 Caucasian students were tested and 94% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. There were no LEP students enrolled in the school in 2008-10.

4. Melbourne Elementary – Benchmark – Grade 6 – Math – Combined Population: In 2008, 45 students were tested and 89% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009 43 students were tested and 86% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 51 students were tested and 76% scored proficient or advanced. An analysis of the open response and multiple-choice questions for 2008-10 revealed that students scored lower in open response, 60.0%, than in multiple-choice, 71.3%. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Numbers and Operations, 51.6%, Geometry, 53.8%, and Measurement 45.4%. The Item-by-Item Analysis indicates that the areas of concern are:
  - G.8.6.5: Identify similar figures and explore their properties
  - G.10.6.2: Plot points that form the vertices of a geometric figure and draw, identify and classify the figure
  - G.11.6.1: Identify two-dimensional patterns (nets) for three-dimensional solids, such as prisms, pyramids, cylinders, and cones
  - M.12.6.2: Make conversions within the same measurement system in real world problems (Ex. hours to minutes to seconds, meters to cm, feet to inches, liters to milliliters, quarts to gallons, etc)
  - M.12.6.3: Compare and contrast the differences among linear units, square units, and cubic units
  - M.13.6.4: Establish and apply formulas to find area and perimeter of triangles, rectangles, and parallelograms
  - NO.1: Convert, compare and order fractions (mixed numbers and improper fractions) decimals and percents and find their approximate locations on a number line
  - NO.2.6.5: Model multiplication and division fractions (including mixed numbers) and decimals using pictures and physical objects (Ex: weight, money and measuring cups)
  - DAP.15.6.1: Interpret graphs such as double line graphs and circle graphs
  - DAP.17.6.1: Distinguish between theoretical and experimental probability
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 4 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 0% scored proficient or advanced. The data analysis revealed students scored lower in Open Response, 16.3%, than in Multiple-Choice, 45.5%. Areas of concern for the three-year data averages are found in Open Response in Data Analysis, 12.5%, Number Sense, 0%, Geometry, 18.8%, and Measurement, 6.3%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 24 students were tested and 88% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 79% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 40 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 70% scored proficient or advanced. Race and LEP: In 2008 all 45 students tested were Caucasian and 89% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 43 Caucasian students were tested and 86% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008-2010, 48 Caucasian students were tested and 75% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native, 1 Asian, and 1 Hispanic student were tested and 100% scored proficient or advanced. There were no LEP students enrolled in the district in 2008-2010.
5. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 3 – Mathematics - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 36 students were tested and 69.4% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 40 students were tested with a NPR of 60% in Mathematics Problem Solving. In 2010, 47 students were tested and scored a NPR of 53%. Areas of concern are found in:
  - Number Sense – Communication and Representation (57.4%)
  - Number Sense – Estimation Thinking Skills (57.4%)
  - Number Sense – Reasoning and Problem Solving (44.7%)
  - Operations – Reasoning and Problem Solving (46.8%)
  - Patterns and Relationships – Mathematical Connections (55%)
  - Geometry – Mathematical Connections Thinking Skills (25.5%)
  - Measurement – Mathematical Connections (57.4%)
 Student with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 64%. In 2010, 5 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 25%. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 21 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 66.7% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 50%. In 2010, 34 economically disadvantaged students were tested and scored a NPR of 58%. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, 34 Caucasian students were tested and 70.6% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. There was one Hispanic student tested and 0% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. Also, one African American was tested and did not score above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested with a NPR of 60%. In 2009, 1 Hispanic student was tested with a NPR of 55%. In 2010, 43 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 54%. In 2010, 2 African American students were tested and scored a NPR of 59%. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and scored a NPR of 12%. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and scored a NPR of 69%.
6. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 4 – Mathematics - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 41

Supporting  
Data:

- students were tested and 80.5% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 41 students were tested with a NPR of 63% in Mathematics Problem Solving. In 2010, 43 students were tested and scored a NPR of 63%. Areas of concern are found in: • Number Sense Problem Solving – Mathematical connections (7.0%) • Number Sense – Reasoning and Problem Solving (58.1%) • Operations – Reasoning and problem solving (44.2%) • Geometry – Mathematical connections (41.9%) • Geometry – Communication and representation basic understanding (27.9%) Students with Disabilities: In 2009, 3 students with disabilities were tested and 33.3% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2010, 3 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 46% in Math Problem Solving. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2009, 27 students were tested and 77.8% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 18 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 64%. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, 1 Hispanic student was tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 38 Caucasian students were tested with a NPR of 64% in Math Problem Solving. One African American student was tested with a NPR of 99%; one Hispanic student was tested with a NPR of 15%; one Native American student was tested with a NPR of 26% in Math Problem Solving. In 2010, 42 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 64%. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native was tested and scored a NPR of 26%.
7. Melbourne Elementary – Grade 5 – Mathematics - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 46 students were tested and 73.9% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 41 students were tested with a NPR of 57% in Mathematics Problem Solving. In 2010, 34 students were tested and scored a NPR of 69%. Areas of concern are found in: • Number Sense – Mathematical connections (29.4%, 38.2%) • Operations – Communication and representation (44.1%) • Patterns and Relationships – Reasoning and problem solving (55.9%) • Measurement – Estimation (52.9%) • Measurement – Reasoning and problem solving (58.8%, 29.4%) Students with Disabilities: In 2009, 2 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 24%. In 2010, 3 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 25% in Mathematics Problem Solving. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 25 students were tested and 72% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 25 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 49% in Math Problem Solving. In 2010, 17 economically disadvantaged students were tested and scored a NPR of 59%. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during 2008-2010 school year. In 2008, all 46 students tested were Caucasian and 73.9% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested with a NPR of 56%. One Asian student was tested with a NPR of 33%; one Hispanic student was tested with a NPR of 97% in Math Problem Solving. In 2010, 33 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 70%. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and scored a NPR of 10%.
  8. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 6 – Mathematics - SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 45 students were tested and 84.4% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 43 students were tested with a NPR of 75% in Math Problem Solving. In 2010, 51 students were tested and scored a NPR of 60%. Areas of concern are found in: • Number Sense – Communication and Representation (54.9%) • Number Sense – Reasoning and Problem Solving (58.8%) • Operations – Reasoning and problem solving (35.3%, 52.9%) • Operations – Estimation (39.2%) • Operations – Communication and Representation (27.5%) • Patterns and Relationships – Mathematical Connections (58.8%) • Probability – Estimation (43.1%) • Probability – Mathematical Connections (35.3%) • Measurement – Estimation (56.9%) Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 3 students were tested and 33.3% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 4 students with disabilities were tested with a NPR of 66%. In 2010, 2 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 25% in Mathematics Problem Solving. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 24 students were tested and 79.2% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2009, 23 economically disadvantaged students were tested with a NPR of 66% in Mathematics Problem Solving. In 2010, 40 economically disadvantaged students were tested and scored a NPR of 56%. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, all 45 students tested were Caucasian and 84.4% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, all 43 students tested were Caucasian with a NPR of 75% in Math Problem Solving. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and scored a NPR of 80%. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native was tested and scored a NPR of 72%. In 2010, 48 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 59%.
  9. Melbourne Elementary – SAT 10 - Kindergarten – Mathematics - Combined Population: In 2009, 54 students were tested and 34% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2010, 66 students were tested and 49% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in: Numbers & Operations: Identify the set with the greatest number of elements (48%) • Numbers & Operations: Computation of subtraction facts (29%) • Numbers & Operations: Computation of addition facts (43%) • Numbers & Operations: Translate pictures to symbolic notation (26%) • Data, Statistics, & Probability: Identify possible or impossible events (27%) • Data, Statistics, & Probability: Use data presented in a pictograph (30%) • Reasoning: Solve problems using logical reasoning (45%) • Reasoning: Solve problems using numerical reasoning (54%) Students with Disabilities: In 2009, 14 students with disabilities were tested and 21% scored at or above the 50th percentile in

Mathematics. In 2010, 7 students with disabilities were tested and 29% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2009, 29 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 25% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 48 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 40% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. Race and LEP: In 2009, 53 Caucasian students were tested and 35% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2009, 1 African American student was tested and 0% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 62 Caucasian students were tested and 48% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 student classified as Two-or-More was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 African American student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 Asian student was tested and 0% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school years.

10. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 1 – Mathematics – SAT 10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 42 students were tested and 73.8% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2009, 44 students were tested and 63% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 56 students were tested and 64% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. Areas of concern are found in:
  - Problem Solving: Compare numbers & sets of 100 (59%)
  - Problem Solving: Solve problems using numerical reasoning (55%)
  - Data, Statistics, Probability: Identify likely outcomes (53%)
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 5 students with disabilities were tested and 80% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2009, 4 students with disabilities were tested and 50% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 12 students with disabilities were tested and 36% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 30 students were tested and 73% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2009, 27 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 52% scored above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2010, 42 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 59% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, there were 39 Caucasian students tested and 74.4% scored above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. There was 1 Hispanic student tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested and 62% scored above the 50th percentile. One Native American student was tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 55 Caucasian students were tested and 63% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 African American student was tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics.
11. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 2 – Mathematics – SAT10 - Combined Population: In 2008, 39 students were tested and 76.9% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 38 students were tested and 53% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 39 students were tested and 66% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in:
  - Problem Solving: Compare numbers and sets up to 100 (62%)
  - Operations: Identify a number sentence that represents the inverse property of addition (61%)
  - Measurement: Read or interpret temperature in customary units (51%)
  - Measurement: Estimate weight using customary or non-standard units (57%)
  - Mathematics Connections: Read or interpret temperature in customary units (51%)
 Students with Disabilities: In 2008, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 100% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 4 students with disabilities were tested and 50% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2010, 5 students with disabilities were tested and 75% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2008, 23 students were tested and 69.6% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 26 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 54% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. In 2010, 27 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 62% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics. Race and LEP: There were no LEP students enrolled during the 2008-2010 school years. In 2008, 38 Caucasian students were tested and 76.3% scored above the 50th percentile in Math. In 2008, one Hispanic student was tested and scored above the 50th percentile in Math. There were no African American students tested in 2008. In 2009, 36 Caucasian students were tested and 53% scored above the 50th percentile. One Asian student was tested and 100% scored above the 50th percentile; one Hispanic student was tested and 0% scored above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 38 Caucasian students were tested and 68% scored at or above the 50th percentile. In 2010, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native student was tested and 0% scored at or above the 50th percentile in Mathematics.
12. Melbourne Elementary School Attendance – AYP - Growth: In 2008, the attendance rate was 94.7%. In 2009, the attendance rate was 94.9%. In 2010, the attendance rate was 93.7%. The combined population of students was 86.1% proficient in Math, and 81.2% proficient in Literacy during 2008-2010. Growth was met by 79% of the students in literacy and 65% in Math in 2010. Melbourne Elementary met standards and the AYP status was "Achieving" for 2008-2010.

Goal To improve the open response skills in mathematics, with emphasis on Data Analysis, Measurement, Algebra and Numbers and Operations

Benchmark To meet state adequate yearly progress and to exceed the Melbourne Elementary 2008-2010 overall average of proficiency in math of 73.5% by 5.3% in 2011

Intervention: Align mathematics curriculum to Arkansas Frameworks:

Scientific Based Research: Jacobs, Heidi Hayes. (2004). Getting results with curriculum mapping. Alexandria: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NEEDS ASSESSMENT & ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLANS: Administrators participate in the Instructional Leadership Training offered by NAESC in order to disaggregate data, develop AIP reports, determine AYP, determine areas of weaknesses and strengths on which to base curriculum mapping development and alignment. Data analysis will then be conducted by each principal & staff in order to evaluate the ACSIP. The leadership training for 2010-2011 is scheduled for June 22-24, 2010. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
NEEDS ASSESSMENT & ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLANS/IRI: The administration and counselors will conduct staff development for the teachers to disaggregate data in order to develop AIP's/ IRI's, determine Adequate Yearly Progress status, make improvements in alignment of the curriculum mapping, and make necessary changes to the ACSIP. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
ALIGNMENT: Teachers will continue to evaluate and improve the curriculum mapping for the adopted mathematics textbooks, Scott Foresman/Addison Wesley, by aligning maps both vertically and horizontally within the school district. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
ALIGNMENT: Teachers will align the Scott Foresman/Addison Wesley textbook adoption curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks for math and use the data disaggregation results to determine strengths and weaknesses in the mapping in order to more effectively align the curriculum map for each class and each grade level. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
EQUITY, ALIGNMENT, COLLABORATION: Teachers will meet with the Gifted & Talented teacher, Special Education teachers, and the 504 coordinator to determine those students who require a more challenging curriculum acquired in GT, as well as those students requiring modifications in the Resource Room or classroom.	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

<p>Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>				
<p>ALIGNMENT: Teachers will participate in data disaggregation professional development in August before school begins with the principal and counselor. Areas of strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum mapping will be determined at this time. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION: Teachers will analyze the CRT and NRT data as they vertically and horizontally align the curriculum to meet the needs of the students as determined by the Benchmark results. Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT/PLAN EVALUATION: Teachers, parent representatives, and administration meet annually in an on-going effort to make additions and deletions to the ACSIP in order to improve student achievement. Evaluations of the plan are data driven. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Public Library</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>COLLABORATION/WELLNESS: The Health/Wellness Committee for Melbourne School District will suggest activities to promote best practices for promoting physical fitness and health, which promotes learning in the Melbourne Elementary math program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Patti Smith, School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>TRANSITION: Students and parents of the district 6th grade classes will be presented with the information on Smart Core and Common Core Curriculum choices for high school in order to make a more positive transition into grades 7-12. Melbourne School District parents and an administrator complete and sign the "Smart Core Informed Consent" form. Students of 6th grade attend an orientation session at Melbourne High in May 2011 and again in August 2011. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT plans for all the teachers will be based on the needs assessments for math and literacy and will be tied directly to the ACSIP. Principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, and all appropriate personnel will be included in planning and implementing the professional development for the Melbourne School District. Parent, student, and community input will be encouraged.</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>

<p>Action Type: Equity  Action Type: Parental Engagement  Action Type: Professional Development  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>COLLABORATION: The coordination and integration of all curriculum programs and services for math and literacy that are provided by the state, federal, or locally will be used to improve instruction for the students and increase student proficiency.  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE COMPACT AGREEMENT: Parents, students, and teachers are provided with a School-wide Compact Agreement, which is included in the student handbook, annually. As set forth by the Melbourne School District Parental Involvement Plan the recommended roles of parents/guardians are as follows: Communicate with faculty and staff; Be active members in school activities and functions; Offer assistance to your children to ensure academic success. The recommended roles of students are as follows: Be active and engaged learners in the classroom and at home; Take responsibility for actions and education; Obey classroom and school rules. The recommended roles of teachers are as follows: Effectively communicate with parents/guardians; Effectively communicate with students; Provide an open atmosphere for successful learning; Provide parents/guardians with up-to-date progress on student achievement and behavior; Attend professional growth opportunities.  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Parental Engagement  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Community Leaders</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: The Title I Parent/Teacher Advisory Committee will meet two times per year to make recommendations on the math and literacy curriculum, specifically, with how Title I may supplement the program.  Action Type: Collaboration  Action Type: Parental Engagement  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Carolyn Blevins, Title I Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Community Leaders</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Staff Development for Melbourne School District for 2010-2011 includes: Power Point, Smart Classroom, Classroom Response System, etc. - 12 hours; Curriculum Development &amp; Alignment, 12 hours; Instructional Strategies in Literacy, 6 hours; Health &amp; Nutrition, Code of Ethics for Educators, and Parental Involvement - 6 Hours; Arkansas History - 2 hours; Through the Looking Glass - 6 hours; Are We Having Fun Yet - 6 hours; Off-campus professional development offerings for other instructional areas are subject to approval by the building</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

<p>administrator.                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				
<p>Recommendations for strategies for RECRUITING AND MAINTAINING HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS have been addressed in the personnel handbook and will be reviewed annually. All of the elementary staff has been designated as HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTORS. The paraprofessionals meet the educational requirements of 2010.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Gerald Cooper, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET:                  _____</p>
<p>TRANSITION: Melbourne Elementary School works closely with the area preschools and the Headstart Program in order to transition pre-school children into the public school in a positive manner. NAESC, Speech and Resource teachers, the preschool directors, the administration, parents, and the Kindergarten teachers hold a conference on each child that is enrolling in the Kindergarten classes in the fall. Recommendations are made at this time.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET:                  _____</p>
<p>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION: Teachers and staff will be provided with a variety of strategies to help close the gap between those students that are not yet proficient with those that have reached proficiency. These strategies , such as; DRA, DIBELS, STAR Math, small group tutoring, computer lab, individual tutoring, extended class time for math and literacy, after school tutoring, etc., will be used daily, or as needed, with those students to ensure student achievement is on track. These students, along with the parents and teachers, will devise a plan for improvement. They will be placed on a remediation plan until proficiency is met.                  Action Type: AIP/IRI                  Action Type: Collaboration</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET:                  _____</p>
<p>ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT OR IRI: Melbourne Elementary teachers will meet with the parents of students requiring an IRI and AIP in 2010. Teachers and parents will meet during the first week of school to discuss the areas of weakness for the students and the options available for the remediation plan. Decisions will be made at this time by the parents, students, and teachers as to the intervention methods to use to increase proficiency in literacy and math.                  Action Type: AIP/IRI                  Action Type: Parental Engagement</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  ACTION BUDGET:                  _____</p>
<p>COLLABORATION/ALIGNMENT: Teachers will be given a presentation of the requirements</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> </ul>	<p>—————                  _____</p>

<p>of Title I, how it will supplement the interventions and actions in the ACSIP, etc. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>		<p>End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>MELBOURNE ELEMENTARY - PROGRAM EVALUATION – Alignment of the Mathematics Curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks: The mapping/data analysis will be closely monitored as results of the CRT and NRT are made available. Teachers and administrators participate in staff development that analyzes the test results as they relate to the Arkansas Frameworks and the horizontal and vertical mapping of the school district, develops the AIP's, and makes necessary changes to interventions in the ACSIP based on data analysis. The long range objective is to reach 100% proficiency. Success of the mapping and data analysis is measured by the increased number of proficient students in the district each year. The goal Melbourne Elementary School of Melbourne District has set for Math exceeds the state AYP. Proficiency in math for 2010 was an average of 81.2% proficient or advanced for the combined populations in grades 3-6. The goal for 2011 is for 85% of the students to be proficient or advanced. Data analysis conducted in August of 2010 indicated students of the 3rd-6th grade students scored lower in open response than in Multiple-Choice. • In 2010, 89% of the Third Grade students scored proficient or advanced. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Geometry, 42.1%, Measurement, 52.1%, and Number Sense and Operations, 55.8%. Areas of weakness in geometry are Geometric Shapes and Relationships, Measurement and Real-World Objects, Mental Computation, and Graphs. • In 2010, 80% of the Fourth Grade students scored proficient or advanced. Areas of concern are found in Geometry open-response, 45.0%, Measurement, 56.3%, and Data Analysis open-response, 58.3%. Students scored lower on Geometry-Line Segments, Rays, Intersecting and Perpendicular Lines, etc. Other areas of concern are Finding Area, Place Value Multiple-Digit Computation, Equations, and Inequalities. • In 2010, 91% of the Fifth Grade students scored proficient or advanced. Areas of concern for the three-year data include Open Response,43.7%, and Multiple-Choice,56.7%, in Measurement, Open Response in Algebra, 52.5%, Number Sense, 57.1%, Data Analysis, 43.7%, and Geometry, 57.0%. Areas of weakness are found in Finding Area, Using Models, Variables, One Operation Function Tables, Geometric Vocabulary, Volume, and Graphs. • In 2010, 76% of the Sixth Grade students scored proficient or advanced in math. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>

<p>response in Numbers and Operations, 51.6%, Geometry, 53.8%, and Measurement, 45.4%. Areas of weakness are found in Properties of Figures, Two- and Three-Dimensional Shapes, Points and Vertices, Converting Measurement in Real-World, Compare &amp; Order Fractions, Model Multiplication and Division of Fractions, Graphs, and Probability. • In 2010, 49% of the Kindergarten students scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in Computation of Addition and Subtraction Facts, Translate Pictures to Symbols, Solve Problems Using Numerical and Logical Reasoning, and Using a Pictograph. • In 2010, 64% of the First Grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in Problem Solving for Sets of 100, Problem Solving with Numerical Reasoning, and Probability. • In 2010, 66% of the Second Grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in Problem Solve Sets of 100, Inverse Property in Addition, Measurement of Temperatures in Customary and Non-Standard Units. • In 2010, 53% of the Third Grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile in Math. Areas of concern are found in Estimation, Reasoning and Problem Solving, Mathematical Connections and Thinking Skills. • In 2010, 63% of the Fourth Grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in Reasoning and Problem Solving and Mathematical Connections with Real-World Events. • In 2010, 69% of the Fifth Grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile in math. Areas of concern are found in Mathematical Connections, Reasoning and Problem Solving, and Estimation. • In 2010, 60% of the Sixth Grade students scored at or above the 50th percentile. Areas of concern are found in Reasoning and Problem Solving, Estimation, Communication and Representation, and Mathematical Connections to Real-World. The mathematics curriculum alignment will continue to be implemented as designed. The program evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>COORDINATION OR FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL FUNDS: Title I funds allocated will be used to equip classroom with the component of a "Smart Classroom". Smart Boards, Classroom Response Systems, Projectors/Document Cameras, Wiring, etc. will be included in the classroom package for Smart Classrooms. The cost per room will be approximately \$2500. Nine rooms will receive the new equipment that will be utilized to incorporate technology in the existing Literacy Curriculum (Second Grade-</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Capital \$7200. Outlay: Title I - Materials \$1800. &amp; Supplies: Title I - Purchased \$900. Services:</p>

<p>2, First Grade-3, Kindergarten-4).                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				<p>ACTION BUDGET: \$99</p>
<p>ASSESSMENT/POINT-IN-TIME                  REMEDIATION: Target Assessment provided by NAESC will be utilized to evaluate students in mathematics for grades 3-6. Students will participate in the Target Assessments at the end of each nine-weeks period. The principal and classroom teachers will analyze the scores to determine those students who will require remediation.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Each teacher and his/her principal will complete a professional development plan based on student proficiency on the benchmark testing for math, literacy, and science. To be included in the plan will be criteria for areas of weaknesses for the teacher in the subjects they must teach. Formal and informal teacher evaluations conducted by the principal, along with mapping &amp; alignment and data analysis, will be determining sources for professional development opportunities the teacher should select. Each teacher is required to complete a minimum of 60 hours professional development that ensures professional growth and has been approved by the campus administrator.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Professional Development                  Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES: Options for parents/guardians to become involved in school are as follows: Open House/Orientation; Parent/Teacher Conferences; "Bridging the Gap" Night; Volunteering; Tutors; Readers; Chaperones; Communication by Phone, E-Mail, District Website, Assignment Notebook, and Memos.                   Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Elementary Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Community Leaders</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT: As a component of Informational Packets, parents will receive a copy of the Melbourne District Parental Involvement Plan. Included in the plan will be the Schoolwide Compact; Calendar of Parent Involvement Meetings by campus; Annual School Calendar which includes two parent/teacher conferences; Volunteer Resource Survey; Seminars offered for parents and students involved in decision making; Information on the School Improvement Association and School Booster Club; Parent Facilitator Information for each campus; Student Handbook which</p>	<p>Lori Loggains,                  Principal</p>	<p>Start:                  07/01/2010                  End:                  06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>

contains information for the parents on developmentally appropriate learning activities in the home environment; Modes of communication with the teacher in order to better assist in the child's learning. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				
COLLABORATION: Melbourne School District will collaborate with Arkansas State University in order to utilize the services of Science Specialist - Debby Rogers. Northeast Ark. Rural Institute for Math and Science. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
COORDINATION OF FUNDS/TITLE I: A paraprofessional will be employed to assist the classroom teacher and special education teacher as they move the resource students toward proficiency in literacy. (FTE - 0.8) Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	Title I - Employee \$5498. Salaries: Title I - Employee \$1190. Benefits:  ACTION BUDGET: \$66
COORDINATION OF STATE/FEDERAL/LOCAL FUNDS-IIA: A teacher will be hired to reduce class size in First and Second Grades. Action Type: Alignment	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	Title II-A - Employee \$19243. Salaries: Title II-A - Employee \$6414. Benefits:  ACTION BUDGET: \$25657.
ACSIP APPROVAL: The 2010-2011 Melbourne Elementary ACSIP was approved by the board of directors on Tuesday, September 28, 2010. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation	Gerald Cooper, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Community Leaders</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
Total Budget:				\$42245

Intervention: Implementation of Accelerated Math as a Supplemental Program:  
 Scientific Based Research: Renaissance Learning. School Renaissance Institute. (2001). Summary of independent ma research regarding accelerated math. Educational Research Department, 1-16.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Math teachers and resource teachers will participate in staff development on the effective implementation of Accelerated Math and to become familiar with any new innovations available through Accelerated Math. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Cindy Billingsley, Math Instructor	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Outside Consultants</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

<p>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT &amp; NEEDS ASSESSMENT/PLAN EVALUATION: Math teachers will implement the Accelerated Math program as a supplement to the mathematics textbook in the 5th and 6th grades and inform parents periodically of the effectiveness of the program and evaluation results of the their child's progress. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Cindy Billingsley, Math Instructor	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>IMPLEMENTATION &amp; NEEDS ASSESSMENT/PLAN EVALUATION: Teachers of math will continue to implement the Accelerated Math program as a supplement to the Scott Foresman/Addison Wesley Mathematics textbook and evaluate the effectiveness of the plan by using daily performance assessments, the CRT and NRT, and STAR Math. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>EQUITY: Resource, 504, and other special needs students will be instructed with the Accelerated Math method, as it is written in the IEP's. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education</p>	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>COLLABORATION/HEALTH &amp; WELLNESS: The Wellness committee makes suggestions for activities that may be implemented in the Accelerated Reader program that will promote health/wellness/physical activity in the classroom. This is included in the Wellness professional development all school personnel participate in before school begins. The 10-11 Wellness staff development is scheduled for August 17, 2010. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness</p>	Patti Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIATION &amp; INSTRUCTION FROM HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS: Teachers and staff will be provided with a variety of strategies to help close the achievement gap between those students who are not yet proficient with those that have reached proficiency. These strategies include: STAR Math, small group tutoring, computer lab, individual tutoring, extended class time for math and literacy, after school tutoring, etc. Scientifically researched instructional strategies will be used daily, with those students to ensure student achievement is on track. These students, along with the parents and teachers, will devise a plan for improvement. They will be placed on a remediation plan until proficiency is met. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: Melbourne Elementary School has used the Accelerated Math Program as the Math Curriculum for several years. The teacher, Mrs. Kathy Weston, and Mr. Brightwell, the principal at that time, attended staff development sponsored by Renaissance Learning. During and after the training, Mrs. Weston</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET:

collected data on the positive and negative findings of the program. She presented these statistics and research data she had collected to the teachers and parents. Melbourne Elementary staff and parents agreed that the program should be purchased. The software and hardware necessary for use in the Accelerated Math and STAR Math program for grades 5 & 6 were purchased and Mrs. Weston began using the program to supplement the math textbook. The assessments used were the results of the STAR Math and the CRT. STAR Math assessment progress results are sent to parents quarterly. CRT data is sent to parents annually. Proficiency in math for 2010 was an average of 84% proficient or advanced for the combined populations in grades 3-6. The 2008-2010 average for grades 3-6 was 73.5%. The goal is to gain 5.0% in the overall percent of students who score advanced or proficient for 2009-2011. Students have scored lower in Open Response in Math than in Multiple-Choice. The 3-year average for Open Response is 56.3%, compared to 71.1% in Multiple-Choice. Areas of concern are found in Open Response for the following: Measurement, 51.7%, and Geometry, 49.4%, Algebra, 56.1%, Number Sense, 56.2%, and Data Analysis, 60.7% for Grades 3-6. The SAT 10 results show needed improvement in the following areas: Kindergarten:

- Numbers & Operations: Identify the set with the greatest number of elements (48%)
- Numbers & Operations: Computation of subtractions facts (29%)
- Numbers & Operations: Computation of addition facts (43%)
- Numbers & Operations: Translate pictures to symbolic notation (26%)
- Data, Statistics, & Probability: Identify possible or impossible events (27%)
- Data, Statistics, & Probability: Use data presented in a pictograph (30%)
- Reasoning: Solve problems using logical reasoning (45%)
- Reasoning: Solve problems using numerical reasoning (54%)

First Grade:

- Problem Solving: Compare numbers & sets of 100 (59%)
- Problem Solving: Solve problems using numerical reasoning (55%)
- Data, Statistics, Probability: Identify likely outcomes (53%)

Second Grade:

- Problem Solving: Compare numbers and sets up to 100 (62%)
- Operations: Identify a number sentence that represents the inverse property of addition (61%)
- Measurement: Read or interpret temperature in customary units (51%)
- Measurement: Estimate weight using customary or non-standard units (57%)
- Mathematical Connections: Read or interpret temperature in customary units (51%)

Third Grade:

- Number Sense – Communication and Representation (57.4%)
- Number Sense – Estimation Thinking Skills (57.4%)
- Number Sense – Reasoning and Problem Solving (44.7%)
- Operations – Reasoning and Problem Solving (46.8%)
- Patterns and Relationships – Mathematical Connections (55%)
- Geometry – Mathematical Connections Thinking Skills (25.5%)
- Measurement – Mathematical Connections (57.4%)

Fourth Grade:

- Number Sense Problem Solving – Mathematical connections

<p>(7.0%) • Number Sense – Reasoning and Problem Solving (58.1%) • Operations – Reasoning and problem solving (44.2%) • Geometry – Mathematical connections (41.9%) • Geometry – Communication and representation basic understanding (27.9%) Fifth Grade: • Number Sense – Mathematical connections (29.4%, 38.2%) • Operations – Communication and representation (44.1%) • Patterns and Relationships – Reasoning and problem solving (55.9%) • Measurement – Estimation (52.9%) • Measurement – Reasoning and problem solving (58.8%, 29.4%) Sixth Grade: • Number Sense – Communication and Representation (54.9%) • Number Sense – Reasoning and Problem Solving (58.8%) • Operations – Reasoning and problem solving (35.3%, 52.9%) • Operations – Estimation (39.2%) • Operations – Communication and Representation (27.5%) • Patterns and Relationships – Mathematical Connections (58.8%) • Probability – Estimation (43.1%) • Probability – Mathematical Connections (35.3%) • Measurement – Estimation (56.9%) Teachers and administrator discussed interventions for students requiring an AIP &amp; IRI. Some interventions include: Accelerated Math, Saturday School, After School Tutoring, IMPAC Lab, and In-School Tutoring, Double Blocking Classes, etc. Each parent who had a child requiring an IRI or AIP collaborated with the classroom teacher to determine the best intervention for the particular child. Success of the mapping and data analysis is measured by the increased number of proficient students in the district each year. The program will continue to be implemented but as a supplemental program. The program evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation</p>				
<p>COORDINATION OF STATE/FEDERAL/LOCAL FUNDS-TITLE I: Money allocated will be used to purchase materials and supplies for the Accelerated Math program. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$522. <hr/>ACTION BUDGET: \$522.</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$522</p>

<p>Intervention: Implement IMPACT Computer Lab:</p>				
<p>Scientific Based Research: "Making Standards Work", Doug Reeves, 2000.</p>				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>COORDINATION OF FUNDS &amp; ALIGNMENT: TITLE I FUNDS will be used to employ a full-time aide to assist students and teachers with the use of the IMPACT computer lab as a supplement to enrich math skills taught in the classroom and to reinforce the curriculum math mapping as it is aligned with the Arkansas Frameworks. Mrs. Fay McSpadden will be employed by Melbourne Elementary School as a full-time (FTE - 1.0) Title I aide.</p>	<p>Gerald Cooper, Superintendent</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Employee Salaries: \$7215. Title I - Employee Benefits: \$2348. <hr/>ACTION \$95</p>

Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide				BUDGET:
EQUITY: Technology in the IMPACT Lab will be used to help alleviate any discrepancies in Male/Female learners, Economically Disadvantaged/Non-Economically Disadvantaged students, Students with Disabilities/General Populations in acquiring math skills. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT & NEEDS ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION: Teachers, parents, and students will annually evaluate the IMPACT of the computer lab curriculum in helping the school improve in math performance by analyzing the data received from the test results of the CRT and NRT. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
COLLABORATION: The Impact Lab Director will be involved in the decisions that will be made concerning the activities to promote HEALTH AND WELLNESS in the classroom and, consequently increase proficiency among the students. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Patti Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
PROGRAM EVALUATION: Melbourne School District began the Impact Computer Lab approximately 11 years ago. The district received the lab through a grant. The software that has been made available is to supplement the regular classroom curriculum in math, science, and literacy. Students work on objectives that have been designated by the classroom teacher. At the end of each assignment, students and teachers receive immediate assessment feedback on whether the child is proficient or not yet proficient. Those not yet proficient will receive remediation from the teacher and will be assigned more activities to help the child reach proficiency. Those students that are proficient will be assigned higher level tasks to complete. Progress reports are sent home to the parents quarterly. Evidence of success of the program is seen in the students' daily grades, learning lab assessments of the objectives, and on the annual SAT 10 and benchmark assessments for grades 3-6. In 2010, 89% of the 3rd grade class scored advanced or proficient in math. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Geometry, 42.1%, Measurement, 52.1%, and Number Sense and Operations, 55.8%. In 2010, 80% of the 4th grade students scored advanced or proficient on the benchmark. Areas of concern for the three-year data include Geometry open-response, 45.0%, Measurement, 56.3%, and Data	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET

<p>Analysis open-response, 58.3%. In 2010, 91% of the 5th grade students scored advanced or proficient in math. Areas of concern for the three-year data include Open Response, 43.7%, and Multiple-Choice, 56.7%, in Measurement, Open Response in Algebra, 52.5%, Number Sense, 57.1%, Data Analysis, 43.7%, and Geometry, 57.0%. In 2010, 76% of the 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced in math. Areas of concern for the three-year data include open response in Numbers and Operations, 51.6%, Geometry, 53.8%, and Measurement, 45.4%. Each of the scores increased in 2010. The Impact program will continue to be implemented as designed. The program evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807.                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Program Evaluation                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

Total Budget: \$9!

Intervention: Implement an After-School Tutoring Program:  
 Scientific Based Research: Hofferth, S. L., & Jankuniene, Z. (2001). Life after school. Educational Leadership, 58(7), 19-23.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>NEEDS ASSESSMENT &amp; IMPLEMENTATION OF POINT-IN-TIME REMEDIAITON, AIP/IRI: Teachers and parents will confer as often as necessary concerning student performance on the NRT, CRT, and classroom assessments in math to determine the best course of action to take to remediate the students in after school tutoring.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Parental Engagement                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>PARENTAL INVOLVMENT &amp; EVALUATION: Teachers, administrators, and parents will collaborate on the effectiveness of the after-school tutoring program based on the school's improvement on the NRT/CRT and classroom assessments.                      Action Type: Parental Engagement                      Action Type: Program Evaluation                      Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>COLLABORATION/HEALTH &amp; WELLNESS: The Health/Wellness Committee for the Melbourne School District will give recommendations of activities to be used in the after school program that will promote learning, as well as health and wellness.                      Action Type: Collaboration                      Action Type: Wellness</p>	Patti Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: After School Tutoring began as an intervention for students in need of math and literacy intervention and expanded into a program that allowed all students who were interested to participate. The data gathering year for after school tutoring was in 02-03. The program began in 03-04 with certified teachers as tutors. The after school enrichment teachers collaborated with the classroom teachers on student learner expectations and the Arkansas Frameworks for Math and Literacy, progress of the learner by monitoring daily classroom performance</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET

in math, Star Math Assessments conducted quarterly and the CRT/NRT, which is an annual assessment. Also to be used in 2009-2010 will be the target assessment to be conducted quarterly. Teachers keep an on-going record of the assessment results to use as an evaluation for the student and the program. Data about the effectiveness of after school tutoring was collected from Melbourne Elementary and Melbourne High School. Questionnaires collected by Mrs. Loggains and Mr. Powell concerning their after school programs are compiled and reviewed annually. These questionnaires reveal the parents score the program as being proficient in helping students with problem areas. Attendance records reveal that attendance for the After-school Tutoring is down about 10% from previous years. The committee believes the lower attendance is due to school dismissing so much later than it did when the high school was on the same campus. The ACSIP literacy and math committees made up of teachers, administrators, parents, students, and community leaders analyze the on-going assessment data that has been collected throughout the school year and the benchmark assessments to determine the success of the after school tutoring program. The summary of the three year data shows that students scored lower in open response in each grade level. Areas of concern are found in Geometry, 49.4%, Measurement, 51.7%, Number Sense & Properties, 56.2%, Algebra, 56.1%. All open response scores increased in 2010. The program evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807.  
 Action Type: Parental Engagement  
 Action Type: Program Evaluation

Total Budget:

Intervention: Implement Technology-Based Smart Classrooms:

Scientific Based Research: S.K.S. Gupta, W. Lee, A. Purukayastha, and P.Srimani. (editorial). IEEE Personal Communications, Special Issue on Pervasive Computing, August 2001, Vol. 8, No. 4. pp. 8-9.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
<p>INCLUSION/ALIGNMENT: The "Smart Classroom" design for Melbourne Elementary Campus includes equipment for approximately 5 classrooms. Items included are: Epson Projector, Mount Box, Cable &amp; Wiring, Faceplate, Universal Plate &amp; Mount, Presentation Remote, Document Cameral, Wireless Slate, Surge Protector, etc. The estimated cost of each classroom is \$1,750. All technological equipment will be utilized to supplement the math, literacy, and science instructional strategies in the classroom. In 2010-2011, more classrooms will have the equipment installed.                      Action Type: Alignment                      Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                      End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title I - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$8750.</p> <hr/> <p>ACTION BUDGET: \$87</p>
<p>TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION/ALIGNMENT/PLAN ASSESSMENT: All activities will be directly tied to the Arkansas Mathematics Frameworks. Benchmark Assessments will monitor the success of this supplemental equipment.                      Action Type: Alignment                      Action Type: Program Evaluation                      Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                      End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PROGRAM EVALUATION: The Melbourne School</p>	<p>LeeAnna</p>	<p>Start:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community</li> </ul>	

<p>District has been allotted a large sum of stimulus money over the next two years. Mr. Cooper organized a committee whose primary purpose was to determine the area of greatest need for the district. The committee consisted of all members of the administration, school board representative, parent/community representative, standards-review administrator, members of the faculty and staff, and the technology coordinator. The outcome of the meeting was to first send a questionnaire to the entire faculty to determine their top 5 needs for their classrooms. Mrs. Hoskinds then asked them to number the needs from greatest to least. Teachers were also to supply the rationale for the needs. She then organized the surveys and completed charts for the committee to view and discuss. According to the surveys, it was determined that the area the majority of the teachers requested was technology in the classroom. Mrs. Hoskinds then wrote a proposal featuring all the components of the technology equipment needs of the teachers. The committee then discussed the contents of the proposal and determined that the "Smart Classroom" would be the most beneficial equipment to implement at this time. The "Smart Classroom" will begin implementation and continue purchasing technological equipment in 2010-2011. The primary purpose of the "Smart Classroom" is to supplement the Literacy, Math, and Science Curriculums with technology as set forth by the Arkansas Department of Education Frameworks. The 2008-2010 average for grades 3-6 was 73.5%. The goal is to gain 5.0% in the overall percent of students who score advanced or proficient for 2009-2011. Students have scored lower in Open Response in Math than in Multiple-Choice. The 3-year average for Open Response is 56.3%, compared to 71.1% in Multiple-Choice. Areas of concern are found in Open Response for the following: Measurement, 51.7%, and Geometry, 49.4%, Algebra, 56.1%, Number Sense, 56.2%, and Data Analysis, 60.7% for Grades 3-6. The technology intervention will continue to be implemented as designed according to ACT 807. Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Leaders</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT/TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION: Parents will be invited to attend an open house on Tuesday, August 17, 2010. This will give them the opportunity to visit the Smart Classrooms, the computer lab, and experiment with the digital microscope, etc. Teachers will demonstrate the use of the equipment and give an overview of how it will be utilized to supplement the Math, and Science Curriculum. Teachers will show parents how technology ties in with the Arkansas Frameworks by referring to goals, student learner expectations, assessment requirements, etc. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>

<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT/TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION/COLLABORATION: Teachers and staff will participate in a minimum of 6 hours staff development focusing primarily on proper usage of the equipment purchased for the Smart Classrooms. Staff Development for technology has been scheduled for July 29-30, 2010, on the Melbourne High School Campus. LeeAnna Hoskinds, NAESC Technology Coordinator for Melbourne School District, will be the instructor. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>TECHNOLOGY INCLUSION/EQUITY/SPECIAL EDUCATION: All teachers of the district will have components of a "Smart Classroom" installed. All students will benefit in the supplemental instructional strategies provided through technology inclusion. In Math, the equipment will be used to provide students with alternative instruction in math and writing of the open response. Classroom teachers and resource teachers will be able to model proficient and advanced open response items for the students more effectively by using the projectors and writing tablets. Math Proficiency in math for 2010 was an average of 84% proficient or advanced for the combined populations in grades 3-6. The 2008-2010 average for grades 3-6 was 73.5%. Scores should increase on open response on the mathematics benchmark. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>PLAN ASSESSMENT/ALIGNMENT/COLLABORATION: The effectiveness of the supplemental equipment of the Smart Classrooms and other technological equipment purchased will be assessed by the committee members through the use of teacher questionnaires, surveys and observations, and Data Analysis on the Benchmark results for Mathematics, with focus placed on open response items in Data Analysis, Measurement, Algebra, and Numbers and Operations. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>Lori Loggains, Principal</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>COLLABORATION/WELLNESS: The wellness committee will meet with the teachers and make suggestions of activities that will promote learning and the health and wellness of each student in the mathematics classroom. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness</p>	<p>Patti Smith, School Nurse</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>ACTION BUDGET:</p>
<p>SCHOOLWIDE ASSESSMENT-COORDINATION OF STATE/FEDERAL/LOCAL FUNDS: Melbourne Elementary School will purchase updates for Heart Beeps, a curriculum-based software for Formative and Summative Assessment in Language Arts and Math. This assessment will be</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>_____</p> <p>Title I - Purchased \$1500. Services:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>ACTION \$15</p>

<p>used to provide useful feedback that will determine areas in need of adjustments in instructional strategies for the individual students. The cost for the Heart Beeps license is \$3,000.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion                  Action Type: Title I Schoolwide</p>				<p>BUDGET:</p>
<p>COORDINATION OF FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL FUNDS-TITLE VI: Approximately 22 Ipad will be purchased for Melbourne Elementary School and will be used to incorporate technology in the literacy and math classrooms. Materials to be purchased are: 18 3G 32 GB Ipad @ \$730 = \$13,140.00; 18 Otterbox @ \$100 = \$1,800; 1 Cart @ \$2,500; 18 Applications @ \$250 = \$4,500; Accessories, \$180.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Technology Inclusion</p>	<p>LeeAnna Hoskinds, Tech Coordinator</p>	<p>Start: 07/01/2010                  End: 06/30/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• District Staff</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	<p>Title VI State - Capital Outlay: \$1250.                  Title VI State - Materials &amp; Supplies: \$9810.                  ACTION BUDGET: \$110</p>
<p>Total Budget:</p>				<p>\$21:</p>

Priority 3: To create a healthy school environment that supports consistent health, nutrition, and physical activities the students, teachers and staff, and community.

1. Melbourne Elementary School – BMI Results – 2009-2010: During 2009-2010, the Melbourne Elementary School had an enrollment of 325 students in the school and 190 in grades for which BI assessments are required. 146 students participated in the BMI assessment in 2010. BMI assessm was completed between 01-19-2010 and 05-20-2010. The results for the school were as follows: : Males • Healthy or Underweight = 60% • Overweight or Obese = 40% 66 Females • Healthy or Underweight = 68.2% • Overweight or Obese= 31.8% BMI Classifications for Students by Grade • Kindergarten = 23 Males + 27 Females = 50 Students • Kindergarten Males Healthy or Underweig 78.3% • Kindergarten Females Healthy or Underweight = 55.6% • Kindergarten Males Overweigh Obese = 21.7% • Kindergarten Females Overweight or Obese = 44.4% • Second Grade = 14 Male 16 Females = 30 Students • Second Grade Males Healthy or Underweight = 57.1% • Second Grad Females Healthy or Underweight = NA • Second Grade Males Overweight or Obese = 42.9% • Sec Grade Females Overweight or Obese = NA • Fourth Grade = 23 Males + 10 Females = 33 Student Fourth Grade Males Healthy or Underweight = 52.2% • Fourth Grade Females Healthy or Underwe = NA • Fourth Grade Males Overweight or Obese = 47.8% • Fourth Grade Females Overweight or Obese = NA • Sixth Grade = 20 Males + 13 Females = 33 Students • Sixth Grade Males Healthy c Underweight = 50% • Sixth Grade Females Healthy or Underweight = NA • Sixth Grade Males Overweight or Obese = 50% • Sixth Grade Females Overweight or Obese = NA
2. Melbourne School District - BMI Results - 2008-2009: During 2008-2009, the Melbourne School District was composed of 3 schools with a total of 397 students in grades K, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10. BM was assessed between 02-19-09 and 04-21-09. Of the students assessed, 58 were boys and 65 w girls. The total results for the students in the district were as follows: Males - Healthy or Underwei = 69% Overweight or Obese = 31% Females - Healthy or Underweight = 66.2% Overweight or OI = 33.9% Overall, BMI classification results for Melbourne Elementary School show: \*Approximatel 20.3% of all children measured were in the OVERWEIGHT category. \*Approximately 12.2% of all children measured were identified as OBESE.
3. Melbourne Elementary School - BMI Results - 2007-2008: Students participated in the BMI assessment between 03-02-08 and 03-25-08. Students of K, 2, 4, and 6 were assessed, 75 males 56 females. BMI Classifications are as follows: Healthy or Underweight: \*\*\*Male - 64.0% \*\*\*Fem 69.6% At Risk for Overweight or Overweight \*\*\*Male - 36.0% \*\*\*Female - 30.4% Overall BMI classification results for Melbourne Elementary School show: \*approximately 17.6% measured we at risk OW \*approximately 16.0% were Overweight

Supporting Data:

Goal The Melbourne School District will provide support necessary for the students to make Healthy Lifestyle Choices by implementing strategies and actions to aid in decreasing the average BMI on the annual stude screening.

Benchmark By 2010-2011 the Melbourne School District will show a decrease of the average Body Mass Index for students by 0.5% as evaluated by the annual Body Mass Index Screening.

Intervention: The schools of the Melbourne School District will implement practices to provide opportunities for students to practice healthy behaviors at school, such as healthy food choices and safe and beneficial physical activity resulting in academic proficiency.

Scientific Based Research: Glanz, Karen, Rimer, Barbara K., & Lewis, Francis Marcus. Health Behavior and Health Education: Theory, Research, and Practice. 3rd Edition. (2002) Jossey Bass Publishers. San Francisco, CA.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Health/Wellness staff development will be provided and will be required in the school district for all teachers K-12. Subjects to be covered in the staff development are: BMI, Childhood Obesity, Health and Safety/Crisis, Nutrition, Health, and Physical Activity, Drug Awareness, etc. The professional development will be offered August 17, 2010. Action Type: Wellness	Gerald Cooper, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT/COLLABORATION: To promote physical activity, Melbourne Elementary School will encourage students, parents, and community members to use the walking trails at the Melbourne High School and Elementary sites, the playground facilities, and the gymnasium. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Elementary Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
Through health and physical activity instruction, students of Melbourne Elementary will be provided with alternative healthier activities that will discourage sedentary activities, such as video games and television. Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
ALIGNMENT/HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF: Students in grades K-6 of Melbourne Elementary will be scheduled for physical education/physical activity classes for 150 minutes per week as mandated by the state. Physical education classes will have the state recommended student/teacher ratio and teacher certification. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
ALIGNMENT/WELLNESS: Nutrition education will be integrated into the elementary health/physical education curriculum in order to promote student health and reduce childhood obesity. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
COLLABORATION/EQUITY/ALIGNMENT: Snack and soft drink vending machines will not be allowed on the elementary campus, nor will food fundraisers, in order to promote healthy lifestyle choices. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
ALIGNMENT: Melbourne Elementary will follow the Arkansas Physical Education and Health Education Frameworks for grades K-12. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
COLLABORATION/WELLNESS/PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT: Melbourne Elementary, along with other schools of the district, has developed written policies for all students for health/wellness and safety/crisis plan in conjunction with the state guidelines. Those included in writing the plan for the	Patty Smith, School Nurse	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET

<p>district were: community business leaders, parents, teachers, students, cafeteria personnel, administrators, counselors, nurse, school board member, etc.                  Action Type: Alignment                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Special Education                  Action Type: Wellness</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultants</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	
<p>WELLNESS/EQUITY/COLLABORATION: Teachers and staff will not be using food and beverages as academic or sports performance rewards.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Equity                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT/EQUITY: Parent involvement in decision-making for school activities and the educational process, as it relates to the health and well-being of students will be promoted. (Examples: Bullying and Harassment, Health and Safety, Medication, Health/Physical Activity, Drug Education, etc.)                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Community Leaders</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>WELLNESS: The school cafeteria reflects a healthy, nutritional environment, and students are allowed sufficient time to eat their meals. A variety of flavors of fat free and low fat milk, 100% juice, and water is also available.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	Pat Bray, Cafeteria Director	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>WELLNESS/COLLABORATION: The Wellness Committee will collaborate with the teachers and staff to determine health and physical activities that may be used to enhance the literacy, math, and science curriculum.                  Action Type: Collaboration                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>ALIGNMENT/WELLNESS: Meals served in the cafeteria are highly nutritious and are in compliance with the guidelines of law.                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	Pat Bray, Cafeteria Director	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Staff</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>COLLABORATION/PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT: A maximum of 9 school events per year will be allowed for foods and beverages. These events will be determined by the classroom teachers and administrators. Parents will be provided with a list of acceptable snacks, as well as a copy of the law concerning snacks and beverages in the public schools.                  Action Type: Parental Engagement                  Action Type: Wellness</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
<p>WELLNESS/ASSESSMENT/EQUITY/SPECIAL EDUCATION: Melbourne Elementary will be assessed annually using the School Health Index for Physical Activity, Healthy Eating and Tobacco-Free Lifestyle. The findings of the BMI will be entered in the ACSIP as data. The findings will compare students of the Melbourne District, as well as of other districts, to determine if physical activity/education, nutrition and health education is effective in combating childhood obesity. All children will be given the opportunity to</p>	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET

participate in the evaluation. Action Type: Equity Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Wellness				
Action 2: PROGRAM EVALUATION: The school nurse, Mrs. Loggains, Mr. Brightwell, and cafeteria personnel attended staff development that focused on the key elements for school health: nutrition, activity. Wellness intervention strategies have been included in the curriculum to aid in decreasing the average BMI of the student and to lead them in making healthy lifestyle choices. Healthy snacks, lunches, breakfast meals, physical activity, etc., are just a few of the requirement changes the school has made. After the staff development training, teachers and staff, as they used the ADE guidelines, devised plans for the schools to follow in increasing health awareness for all aspects of life. These actions are included in each of the school plans. Mandated guidelines are included in the district plan as well. The Melbourne Elementary School will continue to implement the wellness program as designed. BMI testing will continue to be administered each spring. Data collection and analysis will be completed and analyzed annually. 146 students participated in the BMI assessment in 2010. BMI assessment was completed between 01-19-2010 and 05-20-2010. The results for the school were as follows: 80 Males • Healthy or Underweight = 60% • Overweight or Obese = 40% 66 Females • Healthy or Underweight = 68.2% • Overweight or Obese= 31.8% BMI Classifications for Students by Grade • Kindergarten = 23 Males + 27 Females = 50 Students • Kindergarten Males Healthy or Underweight = 78.3% • Kindergarten Females Healthy or Underweight = 55.6% • Kindergarten Males Overweight or Obese = 21.7% • Kindergarten Females Overweight or Obese = 44.4% • Second Grade = 14 Males + 16 Females = 30 Students • Second Grade Males Healthy or Underweight = 57.1% • Second Grade Females Healthy or Underweight = NA • Second Grade Males Overweight or Obese = 42.9% • Second Grade Females Overweight or Obese = NA • Fourth Grade = 23 Males + 10 Females = 33 Students • Fourth Grade Males Healthy or Underweight = 52.2% • Fourth Grade Females Healthy or Underweight = NA • Fourth Grade Males Overweight or Obese = 47.8% • Fourth Grade Females Overweight or Obese = NA • Sixth Grade = 20 Males + 13 Females = 33 Students • Sixth Grade Males Healthy or Underweight = 50% • Sixth Grade Females Healthy or Underweight = NA • Sixth Grade Males Overweight or Obese = 50% • Sixth Grade Females Overweight or Obese = NA The program evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
Total Budget:				

Priority 4: To Improve Science Skills with Emphasis on Open Response in Physical Science, Earth and Space Science Life Science, and Nature of Science:

1. Melbourne Elementary - Grade 5 - Combined Population - Science: In 2008, 46 students were test and 63% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 41 students were tested and 49% scored proficie or advanced. In 2010, 34 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. Students

scored an average of 41% in open response, compared to an average of 62.2% in multiple-choice items. Areas of concern are found in open response in Physical Science (2.6), Earth and Space Sci (3.3), and Nature of Science (2.5). Students with Disabilities: In 2009, 2 students with disabilities were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 3 students with disabilities were test and 0.0% scored proficient or advanced. Economically Disadvantaged: In 2009, 25 economically disadvantaged students were tested and 36% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 17 economic disadvantaged students were tested and 41% scored proficient or advanced. Race & LEP: In 2009, there were no LEP students tested. In 2009, 39 Caucasian students were tested and 48% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 1 Asian student and 1 Hispanic student were tested with 0% proficient or advanced. In 2010, 33 Caucasian students were tested and 52% scored proficient or advanced. In 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested and 0.0% scored proficient or advanced.

2. Melbourne Elementary – Grade 5 – Science NRT – Combined Population: In 2010, 34 students wer tested and scored a NPR of 76% in Science. The Item by Item Analysis indicates areas of concern | Earth Constancy Thinking Skills (55.9%) • Physical Form & Function Thinking Skills (55.9%) • Nati of Science Constancy Thinking Skills (55.9%) • Physical Form & Function Thinking Skills (41.2%, 52.9%) • Life Form & Function Thinking Skills (47.1%) • Earth Constancy (41.2%) Students with Disabilities: In 2010, 3 students with disabilities were tested and scored a NPR of 6%. Economicall Disadvantaged Students: In 2010, 17 economically disadvantaged students were tested and score NPR of 63%. Race & LEP: In 2010, all 33 Caucasian students were tested and scored a NPR of 76% 2010, 1 Hispanic/Latino student was tested with a NPR of 5%. There were no LEP students enrollee the school in 2010.

Supporting Data:

Goal To Improve Science Skills with Emphasis on Open Response in Physical Science, Earth and Space Science Life Science, and Nature of Science

Benchmark To meet adequate yearly progress and to increase science benchmark scores by 4.0% in 2011

Intervention: Align the science curriculum with the Arkansas Department of Education Science Frameworks:				
Scientific Based Research: Jacobs, Heidi Hayes. (2004). Getting results with curriculum mapping. Alexandria: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
PROGRAM EVALUATION: The mapping/data analysis will be closely monitored as results of the CRT and NRT are made available. Teachers and administrators will participate in staff development to analyze the test results as they relate to the Arkansas Frameworks and the horizontal and vertical mapping of the school district. The long range objective is to reach 100% proficiency. Success of the mapping and data analysis will be measured by the increased number of proficient students in the district each year. Melbourne Elementary School's goal for science is to increase proficiency by 4% in 2011. In 2010, 34 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. Students scored an average of 41% in open response, compared to an average of 62.2% in multiple-choice items. Areas of concern are found in open response in Physical Science (2.6), Earth and Space Science (3.3), and Nature of Science (2.5). The science curriculum alignment will continue to be developed during 2010-2011. The program evaluation will continue to be developed according to ACT 807. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Outside Consultants</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT/NEEDS ASSESSMENT/ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLANS: Teachers and administrators will participate in staff development in order to disaggregate data to develop AIP reports, determine AYP, determine areas of weaknesses and strengths on which to base curriculum map development and alignment, and to evaluate the ACSIP. Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	ACTION BUDGET

COLLABORATION/ALIGNMENT: Teachers will continue to evaluate and improve the curriculum mapping for the adopted science textbooks, Harcourt, by aligning maps both vertically and horizontally within the school district. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET
TECHNOLOGY & COORDINATION OF STATE/LOCAL/FEDERAL FUNDS: Title I funds will be used to purchase computers and software to enhance the instructional strategies in the classroom by providing more technology-based activities. This material will be used in science, math, and literacy classes for 4th-6th grades. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Computers</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Each teacher and his/her principal will complete a professional development plan based on student proficiency on the benchmark testing for math, literacy, and science. To be included in the plan will be criteria for areas of weaknesses for the teacher in the subjects they must teach. Formal and informal teacher evaluations conducted by the principal, along with mapping & alignment and data analysis, will be determining sources for professional development opportunities the teacher should select. Each teacher is required to complete a minimum of 60 hours professional development that ensures professional growth and has been approved by the campus administrator. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Professional Development	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Performance Assessments</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: The Title I Parent/Teacher Advisory Committee will meet annually to make recommendations on the math, literacy, and science curriculum, specifically, with how Title I may supplement the program. Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Program Evaluation	Danny Brightwell, Title I Coordinator, MES Campus	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> <li>● Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET
COLLABORATION/WELLNESS/EQUITY/SPECIAL EDUCATION: The Health/Wellness Committee, resource teachers, 504 and Equity Coordinator, teachers and administrators for Melbourne School District will suggest activities that will promote best practices for promoting physical fitness and health, which will promote learning in the Melbourne Elementary math program. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Wellness	Lori Loggains, Principal	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Administrative Staff</li> <li>● District Staff</li> <li>● Teachers</li> </ul>	————— ACTION BUDGET
Total Budget:				

- Planning Team

Classification	Name	Position	Committee
Business Representative	Kermit Blevins	Business	ACSIP/Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Amanda Miller	1st Grade Teacher	Math
Classroom Teacher	Amy Anderton	First Grade	Science
Classroom Teacher	Betty Brightwell	Literacy Instructor	ACSIP/Federal Programs
Classroom Teacher	Betty Brightwell	Literacy Instructor	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Bridget Cooper	2nd Grade	Science

Classroom Teacher	Cindy Billingsley	Math Instructor	Math
Classroom Teacher	Janie Miller	3rd Grade	Math
Classroom Teacher	Kelly Swaim	Science Instructor	Science
Classroom Teacher	Kim Powell	Kindergarten	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Linda Box	1st Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Lisa Pitts	6th Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Matt Kelley	2nd Grade	Health/Wellness
Classroom Teacher	Missy Wyatt	3rd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Robin Morris	4th Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Shelia Caraway	2nd Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Tabby Cooper	1st Grade	Literacy
Classroom Teacher	Tammy Miller	Kindergarten	Math
Classroom Teacher	Whitney Morehead	Kindergarten	Math
District-Level Professional	Becky Woods	Gifted/Talented	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE
District-Level Professional	Bob Burns	Art	Math
District-Level Professional	Danny Brightwell	District Federal Programs Coordinator	ACSIP/Federal Programs
District-Level Professional	Greg Manry	Physical Education	Health/Wellness
District-Level Professional	Jan Wesley	Special Education	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Loye Mason	Music	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE
District-Level Professional	Mary Ball	Special Education	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE
District-Level Professional	Melanie Cornelius	Speech Therapist	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Melissia Cooper	Media Specialist	Literacy
District-Level Professional	Sandra Taylor	Counselor	Health/Wellness
District-Level Professional	Sandra Taylor	Counselor	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE
District-Level Professional	Sandra Taylor	Counselor	ACSIP/Federal Programs
District-Level Professional	Tracye Sipe	Special Education	Math
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Pat Bray	Cafeteria Director	Health/Wellness
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Patti Smith	School Nurse	Health/Wellness
Parent	Bridgett McSpadden	Parent	ACSIP/Federal Programs
Parent	Debbie Phipps	Parent	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE
Parent	Katy Blevins	Parent	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE
Parent	Timmie Skelton	Parent	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE
Principal	Lori Loggains	Principal	ACSIP/Federal Programs
Principal	Lori Loggains	ACSIP Building Chairperson	Parental Involvement/Special Ed/G.T./ALE