



[District Menu Page](#) | [Work On Your ACSIP](#) | [Reports](#) | [Federal/State Budgets](#) | [School Completion Status](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Feedback](#) | [Logout](#)

## Source of Funds Report

**GREENLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
P. O. Box 57, Greenland, AR 72737

### Source of Funds Report

For: **NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.**

**Total Amount Reported: \$225217.03**

**Generated on November 11, 2010**

#### **GREENLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$0

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **GREENLAND HIGH SCHOOL -- \$25115.28**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$1000

##### **Priority 2: Mathematics**

**Goal:** Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$4000

##### **Priority 2: Mathematics**

**Goal:** Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$15020.28

##### **Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to multiple choice literacy and practical

content reading passages, and open response content and style writing domains.

**Priority 2: Mathematics**

**Goal:** Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts

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

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$5095

**Priority 1: Literacy**

**Goal:** All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to multiple choice literacy and practical content reading passages, and open response content and style writing domains.

**Priority 2: Mathematics**

**Goal:** Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts

**GREENLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL -- \$31150**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6250

**Priority 1: Reading Comprehension**

**Goal:** All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to open response questions in practical, literary, and content Reading passages and the Content and Style writing domains.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$24900

**Priority 1: Reading Comprehension**

**Goal:** All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to open response questions in practical, literary, and content Reading passages and the Content and Style writing domains.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**GREENLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$168951.75**

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$30550

**Priority 1: Math/Literacy Improvement**

**Goal:** All students will improve in reading, written expression, and mathematics skills.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$129600

**Priority 1: Math/Literacy Improvement**

**Goal:** All students will improve in reading, written expression, and mathematics skills.

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

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

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

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$8801.75

**Priority 1: Math/Literacy Improvement**

**Goal:** All students will improve in reading, written expression, and mathematics skills.

**GREENLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$**

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

---

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0**

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

---

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$0**

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

---

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$0**

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

---

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

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

---

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

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

---

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

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

---

**GREENLAND HIGH SCHOOL -- \$25115.28**

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

---

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0**

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

---

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$1000**

Priority 2: Mathematics

Supporting  
Data:

1. COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 71 students were tested and 43% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 48 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
2. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
3. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES): END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 36 students were tested and 44% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 13 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 58% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
4. ETHNICITY: CAUCISIAN: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 63 students were tested and 39% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 45 were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 67 students were tested and 66% scored proficient or

- advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
5. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
  6. COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 38 students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 33 students were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
  7. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
  8. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES) END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 24 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 19 students were tested and 53% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 17 students were tested and 24% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
  9. ETHNICITY: CAUCASIAN: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 30 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 35% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
  10. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
  11. SAT 10 MATH PROBLEM SOLVING COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 64 students were tested and 75% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2009, 74 students were tested and 74.3% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2008, 72 students were tested and 69.4% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following areas of concern: Language, Linear Functions, and Open Responses. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, LEP, African American, or IEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
  12. ACT EXAM: MATH SEGMENT: In 2010, 59 students tested and 40 were core completers and scored 20.5. In 2009, 35 students tested and 25 were core completers and scored 23.2. In 2008, 35 students tested and 28 were core completers and scored 22.9.
  13. Technology Data: There are a total of 192 computers in the building. Teacher to computer ratio is 1:5. Computer to student ratio is 0.66:1. Actual technology inclusion in classes was reported by 28 teachers.
  14. Graduation rates for the last three years: 2010 - 2009 - 75.3% 2008 - 93.2% 2007 - 83.4%
  15. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the Algebra I and Geometry EOC Exams and the 9th Grade SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results for both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. Through the disaggregation of the most recent year's data(2009-2010) we determined which of specific the SLEs showed weakness in mastery and agreed that those areas would need to be addressed during the 2010-2011 school year. In addition, we studied our Attendance, Disciplinary, and Achievement Data over the past three years. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of determining student learning and behavioral needs. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, norms and expectations in order to dig deeper for the root cause of why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements showed no significant discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. We are modifying our curriculum, instruction, assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations and to continue to meet and exceed both the Arkansas expectations for academic growth and AYP. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that math should continue to be one of our highest priorities. We will select interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address the areas of greatest need. In addition, we meet in grade level teams weekly and as an entire faculty quarterly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our classroom instruction.

Goal Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts  
 Benchmark "The Combined Population, Caucasian, and the SES Subpop did not meet the 2010 AYP target of 64.60% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 73.45% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Greenland High will teach a standards-based mathematics program to its students.				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Big Picture, NSCI Videos, 1999.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
SUMMER SCHOOL will be offered to Greenland High School students not passing core curricular subjects. NSLA funds will be used to support the hiring of staff to run the program. Academic software (such as NovaNet, STAR Suites, and JEDI) will be purchased with NSLA funds to support this action. Non-consumable materials and supplies will be purchased as needed to support this action. This is a supplemental activity. (NSLA: Salary-\$4000, benefits-\$1000) Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Hope Dorman	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$1,000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1,000.00
Total Budget:				\$1,000.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$4000**

Priority 2: Mathematics

Supporting Data:

1. COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 71 students were tested and 43% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 48 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
2. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
3. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES): END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 36 students were tested and 44% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 13 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 58% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
4. ETHNICITY: CAUCASIAN: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 63 students were tested and 39% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 45 were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 67 students were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
5. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
6. COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 38 students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 33 students were tested and 33% scored proficient

or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.

7. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
8. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES) END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 24 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 19 students were tested and 53% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 17 students were tested and 24% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
9. ETHNICITY: CAUCASIAN: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 30 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 35% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
10. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
11. SAT 10 MATH PROBLEM SOLVING COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 64 students were tested and 75% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2009, 74 students were tested and 74.3% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2008, 72 students were tested and 69.4% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following areas of concern: Language, Linear Functions, and Open Responses. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, LEP, African American, or IEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
12. ACT EXAM: MATH SEGMENT: In 2010, 59 students tested and 40 were core completers and scored 20.5. In 2009, 35 students tested and 25 were core completers and scored 23.2. In 2008, 35 students tested and 28 were core completers and scored 22.9.
13. Technology Data: There are a total of 192 computers in the building. Teacher to computer ratio is 1:5. Computer to student ratio is 0.66:1. Actual technology inclusion in classes was reported by 28 teachers.
14. Graduation rates for the last three years: 2010 - 2009 - 75.3% 2008 - 93.2% 2007 - 83.4%
15. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the Algebra I and Geometry EOC Exams and the 9th Grade SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results for both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. Through the disaggregation of the most recent year's data(2009-2010) we determined which of specific the SLEs showed weakness in mastery and agreed that those areas would need to be addressed during the 2010-2011 school year. In addition, we studied our Attendance, Disciplinary, and Achievement Data over the past three years. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of determining student learning and behavioral needs. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, norms and expectations in order to dig deeper for the root cause of why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements showed no significant discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. We are modifying our curriculum, instruction, assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations and to continue to meet and exceed both the Arkansas expectations for academic growth and AYP. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that math should continue to be one of our highest priorities. We will select interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address the areas of greatest need. In addition, we meet in grade level teams weekly and as an entire faculty quarterly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our classroom instruction.

Goal Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts  
 Benchmark "The Combined Population, Caucasian, and the SES Subpop did not meet the 2010 AYP target of 64.60% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 73.45% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Greenland High will teach a standards-based mathematics program to its students.

Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Big Picture, NSCI Videos, 1999.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
SUMMER SCHOOL will be offered to Greenland High School students not passing core curricular subjects. NSLA funds will be used to support the hiring of staff to run the program. Academic software (such as NovaNet, STAR Suites, and JEDI) will be purchased with NSLA funds to support this action. Non-consumable materials and supplies will be purchased as needed to support this action. This is a supplemental activity. (NSLA: Salary-\$4000, benefits-\$1000) Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Hope Dorman	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>Teachers</li> <li>Teaching Aids</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$4,000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$4,000.00
Total Budget:				\$4,000.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$15020.28**

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

1. COMBINED POPULATION: End of Course Literacy Exam: In 2010, 59 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 57 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 65 students were tested and 40% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response Reading: Passage types: Practical, Literary, and content passages; Multiple Choice: Practical, Literary, and Content passages; Writing: content and style.
2. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): In 2010, there were no significant subpopulations tested. In 2009, there were no significant subpopulations tested. In 2008, there were no significant subpopulations tested. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response Reading: Practical and Content passages; Multiple Choice: Content and style.
3. There were no significant subpopulations of LEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): In 2010, 27 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 16 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 27% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response Reading: Passage types: Practical, Literary, and content passages; Multiple Choice: Practical, Literary, and Content passages; Writing: content and style.
5. ETHNICITY CAUCASIAN: In 2010, 50 students were tested and 58% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 51 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55 students were tested and 35% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Passage types: Practical, Literary, and content passages; Multiple Choice: Practical, Literary, and Content passages; Writing: content and style.
6. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanics or African Americans in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
7. SAT 10 TOTAL READING COMPREHENSION EXAM COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 64 students were tested and 59% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2009, 74 students were tested and 44.6% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2008, 72 students were tested and 65.3% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following areas of concern: Content & Literary Passages. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, LEP, African American, or IEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
8. ACT EXAM: In 2010, 59 students were tested: 40 were core completers scoring the following: Reading 21.1 and English 21.3. In 2009, 35 students were tested: 25 were core completers scoring the following: Reading 23.4 and English 22.4. In 2008, 35 students were tested: 28 were core completers scoring the following: Reading 23.5 and English 23.5.
9. Technology Data: There are a total of 192 computers in the building. Teacher to computer ratio is 1:5. Computer to student ratio is 0.66:1. Actual technology inclusion in classes was reported by 28 teachers.
10. Graduation rates for the last three years: 2010 - 2009 - 75.3% 2008 - 93.2% 2007 - 83.4%

11. **COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT:** We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 11th Grade EOC Literacy Exam and the 9th Grade SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results for both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. Through the diagggregation of the most recent year's data(2009-2010) we determined which of specific the SLEs showed weakness in mastery and agreed that those areas would need to be addressed during the 2010-2011 school year. In addition, we studied our Attendance, Disciplinary, and Achievement Data over the past three years. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of determining student learning and behavioral needs. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, norms and expectations in order to dig deeper for the root cause of why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements showed no significant discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. We are modifying our curriculum, instruction, assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations and to continue to meet and exceed both the Arkansas expectations for academic growth and AYP. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that literacy should continue to be one of our highest priorities. We will select interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address the areas of greatest need. I addition, we meet in grade level teams weekly and as an entire faculty quarterly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our classroom instruction.

**Goal** All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to multiple choice literacy and practical content reading passages, and open response content and style writing domains.

**Benchmark** "The Combined Population and the Caucasian Subpop did not meet the 2010 AYP target of 67.75% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 75.81% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT: The Greenland High School will comply with the Parental Engagement requirements as outlined in ACT 307 of 2007, ACT 397 of 2009, and Title I-A of No Child Left Behind, as well as the six required components of Building Parent Involvement Capacity.				
Scientific Based Research: "Trust and the family - school relationship: Examination of parent teacher differences in elementary and secondary grades." Adams, K.S. and Christenson, S.L. 2002 JOURNAL OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY, 38 pp 477 - 497.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Purchase non-consumable instructional and educational materials (including library services and materials), academic assessments, reference materials, computer software & hardware for instructional use, that will be used to improve student academic achievement at Greenland High School.(\$14220.28) Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Hope Dorman & Rick Gales	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>School Library</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$14,220.28 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$14,220.28
<b>Total Budget:</b>				<b>\$14,220.28</b>

Priority 2: Mathematics

**Supporting Data:** 1. **COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM:** In 2010, 71 students were tested and 43% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 48 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.



2. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
3. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES): END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 36 students were tested and 44% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 13 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 58% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
4. ETHNICITY: CAUCASIAN: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 63 students were tested and 39% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 45 were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 67 students were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
5. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
6. COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 38 students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 33 students were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
7. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
8. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES) END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 24 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 19 students were tested and 53% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 17 students were tested and 24% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
9. ETHNICITY: CAUCASIAN: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 30 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 35% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
10. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
11. SAT 10 MATH PROBLEM SOLVING COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 64 students were tested and 75% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2009, 74 students were tested and 74.3% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2008, 72 students were tested and 69.4% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following areas of concern: Language, Linear Functions, and Open Responses. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, LEP, African American, or IEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
12. ACT EXAM: MATH SEGMENT: In 2010, 59 students tested and 40 were core completers and scored 20.5. In 2009, 35 students tested and 25 were core completers and scored 23.2. In 2008, 35 students tested and 28 were core completers and scored 22.9.
13. Technology Data: There are a total of 192 computers in the building. Teacher to computer ratio is 1:5. Computer to student ratio is 0.66:1. Actual technology inclusion in classes was reported by 28 teachers.
14. Graduation rates for the last three years: 2010 - 2009 - 75.3% 2008 - 93.2% 2007 - 83.4%
15. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the Algebra I and Geometry EOC Exams and the 9th Grade SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results for both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. Through the disaggregation of the most recent year's data(2009-2010) we determined which of specific the SLEs showed weakness in mastery and agreed that those areas would need to be addressed during the 2010-2011 school year. In addition, we studied our Attendance, Disciplinary, and Achievement Data over the past three years. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of determining student learning and behavioral needs. We looked at our trend data in order

to better identify the areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, norms and expectations in order to dig deeper for the root cause of why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements showed no significant discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. We are modifying our curriculum, instruction, assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations and to continue to meet and exceed both the Arkansas expectations for academic growth and AYP. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that math should continue to be one of our highest priorities. We will select interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address the areas of greatest need. In addition, we meet in grade level teams weekly and as an entire faculty quarterly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our classroom instruction.

**Goal** Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts  
 "The Combined Population, Caucasian, and the SES Subpop did not meet the 2010 AYP target of 64.60% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 73.45% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Greenland High will teach a standards-based mathematics program to its students.				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Big Picture, NSCI Videos, 1999.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Total Instruction Alignment: NSLA Funds will be used to contract with TLI, as a purchased service, to administer this supplemental program for Math and Literacy. All students (approx. 270) in grades nine through twelve will participate in a pre-test at the beginning of the program, followed by formative assessments at the end of each of the first three 9-week periods. Professional Development activities, provided by TLI, will be aligned to address weaknesses shown on these tests, and will be attended by all core teachers throughout the school year. A post-test will be administered near the end of the school year. All student activities will be conducted during regular school hours. All NSLA used for this activity will be paid to the NWAESC. Total Instruction Alignment: Literacy and Math (FORMATIVE) quarterly assessments will be administered to all students in grades nine through twelve. Data from these assessments will be utilized in scheduled professional development sessions with faculty for the purpose of analyzing data for curriculum holes and improved instruction from alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment, with a special emphasis on targeted sub-populations of special education and economically disadvantaged. (NSLA: purchased service-\$1500, test materials-\$800) Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Program Evaluation Action Type: Special Education	Hope Dorman & Classroom Teachers	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>	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$800.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$800.00
Total Budget:				\$800.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0**  
 There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$5095**

## Priority 1: Literacy

1. COMBINED POPULATION: End of Course Literacy Exam: In 2010, 59 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 57 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 65 students were tested and 40% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response Reading: Passage types: Practical, Literary, and content passages; Multiple Choice: Practical, Literary, and Content passages; Writing: content and style.
2. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (IEP): In 2010, there were no significant subpopulations tested. In 2009, there were no significant subpopulations tested. In 2008, there were no significant subpopulations tested. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response Reading: Practical and Content passages; Multiple Choice: Content and style.
3. There were no significant subpopulations of LEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
4. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (SES): In 2010, 27 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 16 students were tested and 50% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 27% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response Reading: Passage types: Practical, Literary, and content passages; Multiple Choice: Practical, Literary, and Content passages; Writing: content and style.
5. ETHNICITY CAUCASIAN: In 2010, 50 students were tested and 58% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 51 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 55 students were tested and 35% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Passage types: Practical, Literary, and content passages; Multiple Choice: Practical, Literary, and Content passages; Writing: content and style.
6. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanics or African Americans in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
7. SAT 10 TOTAL READING COMPREHENSION EXAM COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 64 students were tested and 59% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2009, 74 students were tested and 44.6% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2008, 72 students were tested and 65.3% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following areas of concern: Content & Literary Passages. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, LEP, African American, or IEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
8. ACT EXAM: In 2010, 59 students were tested: 40 were core completers scoring the following: Reading 21.1 and English 21.3. In 2009, 35 students were tested: 25 were core completers scoring the following: Reading 23.4 and English 22.4. In 2008, 35 students were tested: 28 were core completers scoring the following: Reading 23.5 and English 23.5.
9. Technology Data: There are a total of 192 computers in the building. Teacher to computer ratio is 1:5. Computer to student ratio is 0.66:1. Actual technology inclusion in classes was reported by 28 teachers.
10. Graduation rates for the last three years: 2010 - 2009 - 75.3% 2008 - 93.2% 2007 - 83.4%
11. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the 11th Grade EOC Literacy Exam and the 9th Grade SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results for both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. Through the diagggregation of the most recent year's data(2009-2010) we determined which of specific the SLEs showed weakness in mastery and agreed that those areas would need to be addressed during the 2010-2011 school year. In addition, we studied our Attendance, Disciplinary, and Achievement Data over the past three years. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of determining student learning and behavioral needs. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, norms and expectations in order to dig deeper for the root cause of why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements showed no significant discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. We are modifying our curriculum, instruction, assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations and to continue to meet and exceed both the Arkansas expectations for academic growth and AYP. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that literacy should continue to be one of our highest priorities. We will select interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address the areas of greatest need. I addition, we meet in grade level teams weekly and as an entire faculty quarterly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our classroom instruction.

## Supporting Data:

## Goal

All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to multiple choice literacy and practical content reading passages, and open response content and style writing domains.

"The Combined Population and the Caucasian Subpop did not meet the 2010 AYP target of 67.75% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is expected Benchmark that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 75.81% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT: The Greenland High School will comply with the Parental Engagement requirements as outlined in ACT 307 of 2007, ACT 397 of 2009, and Title I-A of No Child Left Behind, as well as the six required components of Building Parent Involvement Capacity.				
Scientific Based Research: "Trust and the family - school relationship: Examination of parent teacher differences in elementary and secondary grades." Adams, K.S. and Christenson, S.L. 2002 JOURNAL OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY, 38 pp 477 - 497.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
TasselTime (web-based software) will be a tool that students and parents can utilize to investigate what is needed for each grade level to be prepared for entrance into any college in the nation. It also serves as a pacing guide for students and parents to be informed on when to take the ACT Exam, etc. for college entrance. NSLA Funds will be used to support this activity.(\$595) Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Mary Larkan	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>District Staff</li> <li>Outside Consultants</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$595.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$595.00
Total Budget:				\$595.00

Intervention: The analysis of data will serve as a guide for making adjustments within the instructional program. AIPs for basic and below basic performers will be based upon the results of testing data, the curriculum maps will be adjusted to meet the specific needs identified by the data, instructional practices (recognizing the 7 intelligences) will be modified as necessary and frequent assessments will be utilized to gauge progress and dictate "point in time" remediation when necessary.				
Scientific Based Research: American Association of School Administrators. "Using Data to Improve Schools". Arlington, VA. : American Association of School Administrators, 2002.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The JEDI program has been purchased. This is the 3rd year for this program. This will assist in improving students skills in literacy. The intended beneficiaries of the JEDI program are special education and "at risk" students. The actual scope of the beneficiaries also includes regular education students and advanced placement students. JEDI provides students, faculty, and administrators with online assessment and instruction that has proven to increase test scores on state and national standardized tests. In addition, the flexibility that online instruction provides is significant when it comes to alternative education populations. These students respond well to such alternative forms of instruction. JEDI allows teachers to quickly identify at what level a student is functioning in a given subject area, offer remediation online, and generate real time reports to help them plan going forward. The success of the program will be measured by the number of students with passing grades at the end of the school and by the number of students scoring proficient or advanced on formal testing.(\$3000) Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Rick Gales	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>	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: \$3,000.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$3,000.00

Total Budget:	\$3,000.00
---------------	------------

## Priority 2: Mathematics

1. COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 71 students were tested and 43% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 48 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 61% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
2. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
3. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES): END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 36 students were tested and 44% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 13 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 58% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
4. ETHNICITY: CAUCASIAN: END OF COURSE GEOMETRY EXAM: In 2010, 63 students were tested and 39% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 45 were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 67 students were tested and 66% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in Open Response: Geometry of - patterns, relationship between 2 and 3 dimensions, shapes, measurement, and size. Multiple Choice: Language of geometry, triangles, measurement, and geometry of relationships.
5. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
6. COMBINED POPULATION: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 38 students were tested and 63% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 40 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 33 students were tested and 33% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
7. IEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. LEP STUDENTS: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
8. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (SES) END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 24 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 19 students were tested and 53% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 17 students were tested and 24% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
9. ETHNICITY: CAUCASIAN: END OF COURSE ALGEBRA EXAM: In 2010, 30 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 38 students were tested and 55% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 26 students were tested and 35% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis showed consistent weaknesses in: Open Response: Language of Algebra, Solve Equations and inequalities, Graphs and Tables, Functions, Relations, and Patterns, and Polynomial Operations; Multiple Choice: polynomial operations and Language of Algebra.
10. ETHNICITY: HISPANIC: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008. ETHNICITY: AFRICAN AMERICAN: There were no significant subpopulations of students tested in 2010, 2009, or 2008.
11. SAT 10 MATH PROBLEM SOLVING COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 64 students were tested and 75% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2009, 74 students were tested and 74.3% had a NPR score of 50 or above. In 2008, 72 students were tested and 69.4% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content Sub skill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following areas of concern: Language, Linear Functions, and Open Responses. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, LEP, African American, or IEP students tested in years 2010, 2009, or 2008.
12. ACT EXAM: MATH SEGMENT: In 2010, 59 students tested and 40 were core completers and scored 20.5. In 2009, 35 students tested and 25 were core completers and scored 23.2. In 2008, 35 students tested and 28 were core completers and scored 22.9.

Supporting  
Data:

13. Technology Data: There are a total of 192 computers in the building. Teacher to computer ratio is 1:5. Computer to student ratio is 0.66:1. Actual technology inclusion in classes was reported by 28 teachers.
14. Graduation rates for the last three years: 2010 - 2009 - 75.3% 2008 - 93.2% 2007 - 83.4%
15. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: We formed ACSIP Leadership Teams and analyzed the test scores from the 2010 administration of the Algebra I and Geometry EOC Exams and the 9th Grade SAT 10 Exams. We examined the results for both the combined population and EACH subpopulation. Through the diagggregation of the most recent year's data(2009-2010) we determined which of specific the SLEs showed weakness in mastery and agreed that those areas would need to be addressed during the 2010-2011 school year. In addition, we studied our Attendance, Disciplinary, and Achievement Data over the past three years. We aggregated and disaggregated all the data for the purpose of determining student learning and behavioral needs. We looked at our trend data in order to better identify the areas of need and help align classroom instruction with our curriculum, assessment and professional development. We examined our routines, customs, norms and expectations in order to dig deeper for the root cause of why more of our students are not achieving to their full potential. Our 2010 Supporting Data Statements showed no significant discrepancies in achievement, among our various populations. We are modifying our curriculum, instruction, assessment and Professional Development practices to better meet the needs of all our populations and to continue to meet and exceed both the Arkansas expectations for academic growth and AYP. Based on our Data Analysis we came to the conclusion that math should continue to be one of our highest priorities. We will select interventions and coordinate our various state and federal funding sources to address the areas of greatest need. I addition, we meet in grade level teams weekly and as an entire faculty quarterly so that we can review formative, "real time" classroom performance data for the purpose of making decisions regarding the direction, and focus, of our classroom instruction.

Goal Greenland High School will improve the percentage of students proficient or above with emphasis on comprehension and mathematics concepts  
 "The Combined Population, Caucasian, and the SES Subpop did not meet the 2010 AYP target of 64.60% scoring Proficient/Advanced. It is  
 Benchmark expected that each of these populations will meet, or exceed, the 2011 AYP Target of 73.45% scoring Proficient/Advanced, or make AYP through either the "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Greenland High will teach a standards-based mathematics program to its students.				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Big Picture, NSCI Videos, 1999.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Total Instruction Alignment: NSLA Funds will be used to contract with TLI, as a purchased service, to administer this supplemental program for Math and Literacy. All students (approx. 270) in grades nine through twelve will participate in a pre-test at the beginning of the program, followed by formative assessments at the end of each of the first three 9-week periods. Professional Development activities, provided by TLI, will be aligned to address weaknesses shown on these tests, and will be attended by all core teachers throughout the school year. A post-test will be administered near the end of the school year. All student activities will be conducted during regular school hours. All NSLA used for this activity will be paid to the NWAESC. Total Instruction Alignment: Literacy and Math (FORMATIVE) quarterly assessments will be administered to all students in grades nine through twelve. Data from these assessments will be utilized in scheduled professional development sessions with faculty for the purpose of analyzing data for curriculum holes and improved instruction from alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment, with a special emphasis on targeted sub-populations of special education and economically disadvantaged. (NSLA: purchased service-\$1500, test materials-\$800) Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Professional Development	Hope Dorman & Classroom Teachers	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>	NSLA (State-281) - \$1,500.00 Purchased Services: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1,500.00

Action Type: Program Evaluation				
Action Type: Special Education				
Total Budget:				\$1,500.00

**GREENLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL -- \$31150**

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0**

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

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$6250**

Priority 1: Reading Comprehension

1. COMBINED POPULATION (5th grade) BENCHMARK EXAM(CRT): In 2010, 54 students were tested with 73% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 71 students were tested and 68% scored proficient or advanced In 2008, 74 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the Open Response and Multiple Choice questions, in all three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area was the writing style and multiple choice area of weakness was in reading:practical passage.
2. COMBINED POPULATION(6th grade)In 2010, 78 students were tested with 73% scoring proficient/advanced. Each of the populations will met the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced, or make the AYP through either "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. 6th BENCHMARK EXAM (CRT): In 2010 78 students were tested with 69% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 72 students were tested and 62% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 76 students were tested and 68% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in all three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas were in reading practical passages and writing style domain.
3. 7th grade COMBINED POPULATION ON BENCHMARK EXAM (CRT)and each subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet/exceed, the 2011 AYP target of 70% scoring proficient/advanced, or make the AYP through either "Safe harbor" or "Growth" models. 7TH GRADE: In 2010, 78 students were tested with 78% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 71 students were tested and 60% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 60 students were tested and 52% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open resonse and multiple choice questions, in all three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas were in writing content and writing style domains.
4. 8th Grade COMBINED POPULATION ON BENCHMARK EXAM (CRT)and each subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet/exceed the 2011 AYP target of 70% scoring proficient/advanced, or make the AYP through either "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. 8TH GRADE: In 2010, 78 students were tested with 69% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009 61 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 81 students were tested and 76.5% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in all three types of reading passages and writing, revealed that the lowest identified areas were in reading content passage and writing Content domain.
5. IEP Students: 5th grade: There were no significant subpopulations of IEP students in 2010, 2009, 2008. 6th grade: In 2010, 2009, 2008 there was no significant subpopulation. 7th grade: In 2010, 2009 and 2008, there was no significant subpopulation. 8th grade: There were no significant subpopulations of IEP students in 2010, 2009, 2008.
6. LEP Students: There were no significant subpopulations of LEP students in 2010, 2009, or 2008 in grades 5, 6, 7, or 8.
7. SES STUDENTS: 5th GRADE: In 2010, 32 students were tested with 63% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 47 students were tested and 68% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 34 students were tested and 47% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in content open response. 6th GRADE: In 2010, 43 students were tested with 58% scoring proficient or advanced. I

Supporting Data:

In 2009, 35 students were tested and 43% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 38 students were tested and 53% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in the literary reading passages. 7th GRADE: In 2010, 37 students were tested with 46% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 34 students were tested and 53% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 32 students were tested and 28% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in reading content passage. 8th GRADE: In 2010, 28 students were tested with 72% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 33 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 38 students were tested and 60% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in reading content passage and writing multiple choice.

8. ETHNICITY: There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic or African-American students in 2010, 2009, 2008 in grades 5, 6, 7, or 8.
9. ETHNICITY: 5th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 51 students were tested with 71% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 73 students were tested and 71% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 74 students were tested and 62.2% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest identified domains were writing content and reading content and comprehension. The lowest identified areas were writing content domain and reading content. 6th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 51 students were tested and 71 percent scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 75 students were tested and 70% were proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified domain was reading content. 7th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 66 students were tested with 70% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2008, 53 students were tested and 51% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest domain was writing content. 8th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 56 students were tested with 77% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 76 student were tested with 76% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2008, 77 students were tested and 80% socred proficient or above. The lowest identified area was reading content.
10. Fifth Grade SAT10, COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 53 students were tested with 57% at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 67 students were tested and 73.1% in reading and language at or above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 83 students were tested with 59% at or above the 50th percentile. Fifth Grade SAT 10 or ITBS, COMBINED POPULATION (NRT): In 2007, 62 students were tested on the ITBS and 72.6% had an NPR score of 50 or above. In 2006, 56 sudents were tested and 31% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of skill cluster performance revealed the following area(s) of concern: Spelling CAUCASIAN: In 2008, 75 students were tested on the SAT10 with 54.7% scoring above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 60 students were tested on the ITBS and 71.7% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the skill cluster performance reveals the following area(s) of concern: Spelling. Ethnicity: Caucasian: In 2009, 64 students were tested with 71.9% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 74 students were tested with 62.2% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2007, 52 Caucasian students were tested and 61% had an NPR socre of 50 or above. SES: In 2009, 39 students were tested and 74.4% were at or above 50% in reading comprehension. In 2008, 37 students were tested on the SAT10 with 40.5% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 26 students were tested and 61.5% had an NPR score of 50 or above on the ITBS. An analysis of the skill cluster performance reveals the following area(s) of concern: Punctuation. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, IEP, LEP, or African American students tested.
11. Sixth Grade SAT10, COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 53 students were tested with 56.6% at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 72 students were tested and 48.6% were at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 76 students were tested with 55.3% at or above the 50th percentile. Sixth Grade COMBINED POPULATION ON ITBS (NRT): In 2007, 51 students were tested on the ITBS and 49% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content subskill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area(s) of concern: Reading comprehension, Capitalization, and Punctuation. ETHNICITY: In 2010, 2009, and 2008 there were no significant Hispanic or African-American subgroups. Caucasian: In 2009, 66 students were tested with 51.5% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, there were 75 students tested on the SAT10 with 54.7% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 45 students were tested on the ITBS and 46.7% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis indicates spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are areas of concer. LEP: In 2009, 2008, and 2007 there was no significant subgroup. SES: In 2009 36 students were tested with 33.3% at or above the 50th percentiel in reading comprehension. In 2008, 37 students were tested on the SAT10 with 40.5% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 23 students were tested on the ITBS and 34.8% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis indicates area(s) of concern to be: Capitalization and Punctuation. IEP: In 2009, 2008, or 2007 there was no significant subgroup.
12. Seventh Grade SAT10 or ITBS COMBINED POPULATION: ETHNICITY: SAT10 Combined Population: In 2009, 71 students were tested with 51% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 60 students were tested with 65% at or above the 50th percentile. Ethnicity: Caucasian - in 2009, 70 students were tested with 50% at or above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2008, 53



students were tested with 60% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. SES: In 2009, 36 students were tested with 52.8% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 32 students were tested with 56.3% at or above the 50th percentile in reading.

13. Eighth grade COMBINED POPULATION- SAT10 or ITBS (NRT): SAT10 Combined Population: In 2010, 61 students were tested with 79% at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 61 students were tested with 62.3% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 82 students were tested with 48% at or above the 50th percentile. LEP: In 2009, 2008, or 2007 there were no significant sub populations. IEP: In 2009, 2008, & 2007 there were no significant subpopulations. SES: In 2009, 34 students were tested with 52.9% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 38 students were tested with 39.55 at or above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis indicates the following area(s) of concern: Spelling and Capitalization. Analysis indicated the following area(s) of concern: Capitalization and Punctuation. ETHNICITY: In 2010, 2009, & 2008 there were no significant Hispanic or Afro-American sub populations. Caucasian: In 2009, 58 students were tested with 52.9% at or above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2008, 77 students were tested with 63.6% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension.
14. Average Daily Attendance: In 2010, the attendance rate met the required level. In 2009, the attendance rate met the required 91.3% level. In 2008, the attendance rate for the building was 91.13%.

**Goal** All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to open response questions in practical, literary, and content Reading passages and the Content and Style writing domains.

**Benchmark** The Combined population and each subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet/exceed, the 2011 AYP target of 75.7% scoring proficient/advanced, or make AYP through either "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Greenland Middle School will continue to use the Reading Renaissance Accelerated Reading Program.				
Scientific Based Research: Peak, J.P. & M.W. Dewalt. "Reading Achievement: Effects of Computerized Reading Management and Enrichment." ERS Spectrum 12, no. 1 (1994): 31-34.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
A LITERACY INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITATOR (0.5 FTE) will be hired to aid in the additional emphasis being placed on literacy in the Greenland Middle School. The facilitator will assist in curriculum alignment, classroom assessment, instructional strategies, selection of standards based instructional materials, understanding current research, and integrating technology into instruction. The funds used for this person will come from NSLA. [salary: \$24,900; benefits: \$6250] Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Leslie Scates	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• Performance Assessments</li> <li>• School Library</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$6,250.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$6,250.00
Total Budget:				\$6,250.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$24900**

Priority 1: Reading Comprehension

**Supporting Data:** 1. COMBINED POPULATION (5th grade) BENCHMARK EXAM(CRT): In 2010, 54 students were tested with 73% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 71 students were tested and 68% scored proficient or advanced In 2008, 74 students were tested and 56% scored proficient or advanced. The 3 year trend analysis of the Open Response and Multiple Choice questions, in all three types of reading passages revealed that the lowest identified area was the writing style and multiple choice area of weakness was in reading: practical passage.

2. COMBINED POPULATION(6th grade)In 2010, 78 students were tested with 73% scoring proficient/advanced. Each of the populations will met the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced, or make the AYP through either "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. 6th BENCHMARK EXAM (CRT): In 2010 78 students were tested with 69% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 72 students were tested and 62% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 76 students were tested and 68% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in all three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas were in reading practical passages and writing style domain.
3. 7th grade COMBINED POPULATION ON BENCHMARK EXAM (CRT)and each subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet/exceed the 2011 AYP target of 70% scoring proficient/advanced, or make the AYP through either "Safe harbor" or "Growth" models. 7TH GRADE: In 2010, 78 students were tested with 78% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 71 students were tested and 60% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 60 students were tested and 52% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open resonance and multiple choice questions, in all three types of reading passages, revealed that the lowest identified areas were in writing content and writing style domains.
4. 8th Grade COMBINED POPULATION ON BENCHMARK EXAM (CRT)and each subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet/exceed the 2011 AYP target of 70% scoring proficient/advanced, or make the AYP through either "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models. 8TH GRADE: In 2010, 78 students were tested with 69% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009 61 students were tested and 74% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 81 students were tested and 76.5% scored proficient or advanced. The trend analysis of the open response and multiple choice questions, in all three types of reading passages and writing, revealed that the lowest identified areas were in reading content passage and writing Content domain.
5. IEP Students: 5th grade: There were no significant subpopulations of IEP students in 2010, 2009, 2008. 6th grade: In 2010, 2009, 2008 there was no significant subpopulation. 7th grade: In 2010, 2009 and 2008, there was no significant subpopulation. 8th grade: There were no significant subpopulations of IEP students in 2010, 2009, 2008.
6. LEP Students: There were no significant subpopulations of LEP students in 2010, 2009, or 2008 in grades 5, 6, 7, or 8.
7. SES STUDENTS: 5th GRADE: In 2010, 32 students were tested with 63% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 47 students were tested and 68% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 34 students were tested and 47% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in content open response. 6th GRADE: In 2010, 43 students were tested with 58% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 35 students were tested and 43% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 38 students were tested and 53% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in the literary reading passages. 7th GRADE: In 2010, 37 students were tested with 46% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 34 students were tested and 53% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 32 students were tested and 28% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in reading content passage. 8th GRADE: In 2010, 28 students were testwed with 72% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 33 students were tested and 67% scored proficient or advanced. In 2008, 38 students were tested and 60% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified area was in reading content passage and writing multiple choice.
8. ETHNICITY: There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic or African-American students in 2010, 2009, 2008 in grades 5, 6, 7, or 8.
9. ETHNICITY: 5th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 51 students were tested with 71% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 73 students were tested and 71% scored proficient/advanced. In 2008, 74 students were tested and 62.2% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest identified domains were writing content and reading content and comprehension. The lowest identified areas were writing content domain and reading content. 6th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 51 students were tested and 71 percent scored proficient or advanced. In 2009, 75 students were tested and 70% were proficient or advanced. In 2008, 75 students were tested and 69% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified domain was reading content. 7th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 66 students were tested with 70% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2008, 53 students were tested and 51% scored proficient or advanced. The lowest domain was writing content. 8th grade: Caucasian: In 2010, 56 students were tested with 77% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2009, 76 student were tested with 76% scoring proficient or advanced. In 2008, 77 students were tested and 80% socred proficient or above. The lowest identified area was reading content.
10. Fifth Grade SAT10, COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 53 students were tested with 57% at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 67 students were tested and 73.1% in reading and language at or above the 50th percentile. In 2008, 83 students were tested with 59% at or above the 50th percentile. Fifth Grade SAT 10 or ITBS, COMBINED POPULATION (NRT): In 2007, 62 students were tested on the ITBS and 72.6% had an NPR score of 50 or above. In 2006, 56 sudents were tested and 31% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An

analysis of skill cluster performance revealed the following area(s) of concern: Spelling CAUCASIAN: In 2008, 75 students were tested on the SAT10 with 54.7% scoring above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 60 students were tested on the ITBS and 71.7% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the skill cluster performance reveals the following area(s) of concern: Spelling. Ethnicity: Caucasian: In 2009, 64 students were tested with 71.9% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 74 students were tested with 62.2% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2007, 52 Caucasian students were tested and 61% had an NPR score of 50 or above. SES: In 2009, 39 students were tested and 74.4% were at or above 50% in reading comprehension. In 2008, 37 students were tested on the SAT10 with 40.5% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 26 students were tested and 61.5% had an NPR score of 50 or above on the ITBS. An analysis of the skill cluster performance reveals the following area(s) of concern: Punctuation. There were no significant subpopulations of Hispanic, IEP, LEP, or African American students tested.

11. Sixth Grade SAT10, COMBINED POPULATION: In 2010, 53 students were tested with 56.6% at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 72 students were tested and 48.6% were at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 76 students were tested with 55.3% at or above the 50th percentile. Sixth Grade COMBINED POPULATION ON ITBS (NRT): In 2007, 51 students were tested on the ITBS and 49% had a NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis of the Content subskill and Skill Cluster Performance reveals the following area(s) of concern: Reading comprehension, Capitalization, and Punctuation. ETHNICITY: In 2010, 2009, and 2008 there were no significant Hispanic or African-American subgroups. Caucasian: In 2009, 66 students were tested with 51.5% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, there were 75 students tested on the SAT10 with 54.7% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 45 students were tested on the ITBS and 46.7% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis indicates spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are areas of concern. LEP: In 2009, 2008, and 2007 there was no significant subgroup. SES: In 2009 36 students were tested with 33.3% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 37 students were tested on the SAT10 with 40.5% scoring at or above the 50th percentile. In 2007, 23 students were tested on the ITBS and 34.8% had an NPR score of 50 or above. An analysis indicates area(s) of concern to be: Capitalization and Punctuation. IEP: In 2009, 2008, or 2007 there was no significant subgroup.
12. Seventh Grade SAT10 or ITBS COMBINED POPULATION: ETHNICITY: SAT10 Combined Population: In 2009, 71 students were tested with 51% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 60 students were tested with 65% at or above the 50th percentile. Ethnicity: Caucasian - in 2009, 70 students were tested with 50% at or above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2008, 53 students were tested with 60% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. SES: In 2009, 36 students were tested with 52.8% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 32 students were tested with 56.3% at or above the 50th percentile in reading.
13. Eighth grade COMBINED POPULATION- SAT10 or ITBS (NRT): SAT10 Combined Population: In 2010, 61 students were tested with 79% at or above the 50th percentile. In 2009, 61 students were tested with 62.3% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 82 students were tested with 48% at or above the 50th percentile. LEP: In 2009, 2008, or 2007 there were no significant sub populations. IEP: In 2009, 2008, & 2007 there were no significant subpopulations. SES: In 2009, 34 students were tested with 52.9% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension. In 2008, 38 students were tested with 39.55 at or above the 50th percentile in reading. Analysis indicates the following area(s) of concern: Spelling and Capitalization. Analysis indicated the following area(s) of concern: Capitalization and Punctuation. ETHNICITY: In 2010, 2009, & 2008 there were no significant Hispanic or Afro-American sub populations. Caucasian: In 2009, 58 students were tested with 52.9% at or above the 50th percentile in reading. In 2008, 77 students were tested with 63.6% at or above the 50th percentile in reading comprehension.
14. Average Daily Attendance: In 2010, the attendance rate met the required level. In 2009, the attendance rate met the required 91.3% level. In 2008, the attendance rate for the building was 91.13%.

Goal All students will improve in reading comprehension and written expression with additional attention to open response questions in practical, literary, and content Reading passages and the Content and Style writing domains.

Benchmark The Combined population and each subpop MET the 2010 AYP target of 67.6% scoring proficient/advanced. It is expected that each of these populations will meet/exceed, the 2011 AYP target of 75.7% scoring proficient/advanced, or make AYP through either "Safe Harbor" or "Growth" models.

Intervention: Greenland Middle School will continue to use the Reading Renaissance Accelerated Reading Program.
---

Scientific Based Research: Peak, J.P. & M.W. Dewalt. "Reading Achievement: Effects of Computerized Reading Management and Enrichment." ERS Spectrum 12, no. 1 (1994): 31-34.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
A LITERACY INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITATOR (0.5 FTE) will be hired to aid in the additional emphasis being placed on literacy in the Greenland Middle School. The facilitator will assist in curriculum alignment, classroom assessment, instructional strategies, selection of standards based instructional materials, understanding current research, and integrating technology into instruction. The funds used for this person will come from NSLA. [salary: \$24,900; benefits: \$6250] Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Leslie Scates	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Computers</li> <li>Performance Assessments</li> <li>School Library</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$24,900.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$24,900.00
Total Budget:				\$24,900.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$0**  
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies".

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0**  
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$0**  
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services".

**GREENLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$168951.75**

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- \$0**  
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$30550**

Priority 1: Math/Literacy Improvement

Supporting Data:

- In 2010, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 20.0 In 2009, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 21.1 In 2008, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 22.1
- In 2009, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 98.0%. In 2008, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 99.0%. In 2007, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 97.0%.
- In 2009, the attendance rate for the district was 97.3%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the district was 97.5%. In 2007, the attendance rate for the district was 96.4%.
- In 2009, the graduation rate was 88.5% In 2008, the graduation rate was 75.34% In 2007, the graduation rate was 94.8%

5. In 2009, the dropout rate was 2.0% In 2008, the dropout rate was 3.7% In 2007, the dropout rate was 3.9%

- Goal All students will improve in reading, written expression, and mathematics skills.
- Benchmark Students will be expected to meet the state AYP goal in all grades tested on the CRT in mathematics and literacy.
- Benchmark 15% increase of staff who utilize Differentiated Instruction for 70% or more of the time as documented through CWT's.

Intervention: The Greenland School District will provide personnel and programs of intervention for improving instruction and increasing achievement of NSLA identified students at risk of not meeting challenging academic standards. (Budgeting of NSLA funds)				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Big Picture, NSCI Videos, 1999				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
A 1.0 FTE curriculum coordinator will be hired with NSLA funds to coordinate the curriculum with the schools to make sure all faculty and staff are mapping and aligning all subjects in the Greenland district. The coordinator will also provide professional development opportunities for the district staff. Completion of the curriculum maps should impact achievement scores. Test data analysis will serve as the evaluation for the program. [Salary-\$76,000; Benefits-\$16,450] Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Dr. Charles Cudney	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$16,450.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$16,450.00
An additional 1.0 FTE nurse (LPN) will be hired to provide health services for students in the middle school and other schools as needed. This nurse is above the requirements mandated by the state. [Salary-\$35,400; Benefits-\$9,350] Action Type: Wellness	Dr. Charles Cudney	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Central Office</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$9,350.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$9,350.00
The Greenland School District has 2.5 counselors for the 2010-2011 school year. With a student population of 816 we have more counselors than required (1 per 450 students) for a school district. Therefore, the salary and benefits for the two full-time counselors will be paid for out district funds, but the half-time counselor's salary & benefits will be paid out of NSLA funds. [Salary-\$18,200; Benefits-\$4750] Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement	Dr. Charles Cudney	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$4,750.00  ACTION BUDGET: \$4,750.00
Total Budget:				\$30,550.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$129600

Priority 1: Math/Literacy Improvement

Supporting Data:

1. In 2010, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 20.0 In 2009, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 21.1 In 2008, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 22.1
2. In 2009, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 98.0%. In 2008, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 99.0%. In 2007, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 97.0%.
3. In 2009, the attendance rate for the district was 97.3%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the district was 97.5%. In 2007, the attendance rate for the district was 96.4%.
4. In 2009, the graduation rate was 88.5% In 2008, the graduation rate was 75.34% In 2007, the graduation rate was 94.8%
5. In 2009, the dropout rate was 2.0% In 2008, the dropout rate was 3.7% In 2007, the dropout rate was 3.9%

Goal All students will improve in reading, written expression, and mathematics skills.

Benchmark Students will be expected to meet the state AYP goal in all grades tested on the CRT in mathematics and literacy.

Benchmark 15% increase of staff who utilize Differentiated Instruction for 70% or more of the time as documented through CWT's.

Intervention: The Greenland School District will provide personnel and programs of intervention for improving instruction and increasing achievement of NSLA identified students at risk of not meeting challenging academic standards. (Budgeting of NSLA funds)				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Big Picture, NSCI Videos, 1999				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
A 1.0 FTE curriculum coordinator will be hired with NSLA funds to coordinate the curriculum with the schools to make sure all faculty and staff are mapping and aligning all subjects in the Greenland district. The coordinator will also provide professional development opportunities for the district staff. Completion of the curriculum maps should impact achievement scores. Test data analysis will serve as the evaluation for the program. [Salary-\$76,000; Benefits-\$16,450] Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity Action Type: Professional Development	Dr. Charles Cudney	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$76,000.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$76,000.00
An additional 1.0 FTE nurse (LPN) will be hired to provide health services for students in the middle school and other schools as needed. This nurse is above the requirements mandated by the state. [Salary-\$35,400; Benefits-\$9,350] Action Type: Wellness	Dr. Charles Cudney	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• Central Office</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$35,400.00 Employee Salaries: <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$35,400.00
The Greenland School District has 2.5 counselors for the 2010-2011 school year. With a student population of 816 we have more counselors than required (1 per 450 students) for a school district. Therefore, the salary and benefits for the two full-time counselors will be paid for out district funds, but the half-time counselor's salary & benefits will be paid out of NSLA funds. [Salary-\$18,200; Benefits-\$4750] Action Type: Collaboration	Dr. Charles Cudney	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative Staff</li> <li>• District Staff</li> </ul>	NSLA (State-281) - \$18,200.00

Action Type: Equity Action Type: Parental Engagement				Employee Salaries:
				ACTION BUDGET: \$18,200.00
Total Budget:				\$129,600.00

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$0**  
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies".

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- \$0**  
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

**Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$8801.75**

Priority 1: Math/Literacy Improvement

- Supporting Data:
- In 2010, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 20.0 In 2009, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 21.1 In 2008, Greenland's composite ACT scores were 22.1
  - In 2009, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 98.0%. In 2008, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 99.0%. In 2007, the percentage of teachers completely certified in the Greenland district was 97.0%.
  - In 2009, the attendance rate for the district was 97.3%. In 2008, the attendance rate for the district was 97.5%. In 2007, the attendance rate for the district was 96.4%.
  - In 2009, the graduation rate was 88.5% In 2008, the graduation rate was 75.34% In 2007, the graduation rate was 94.8%
  - In 2009, the dropout rate was 2.0% In 2008, the dropout rate was 3.7% In 2007, the dropout rate was 3.9%

- Goal All students will improve in reading, written expression, and mathematics skills.  
 Benchmark Students will be expected to meet the state AYP goal in all grades tested on the CRT in mathematics and literacy.  
 Benchmark 15% increase of staff who utilize Differentiated Instruction for 70% or more of the time as documented through CWT's.

Intervention: The Greenland School District will provide personnel and programs of intervention for improving instruction and increasing achievement of NSLA identified students at risk of not meeting challenging academic standards. (Budgeting of NSLA funds)				
Scientific Based Research: Heidi Hayes Jacobs, Mapping the Big Picture, NSCI Videos, 1999				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The Greenland School District will establish a program that will benefit ESL students, students entering the public school after being home-schooled and students reentering school after being expelled or suspended. ESL students will work with an ESL teacher while using the NovaNET or STARS Suites web-based software on a daily basis as they strive to become proficient in English. Students reentering or entering the public school for the first time will take a Basic Achievement Skills Inventory test that will test the students' mathematical and literacy skills to determine what grade level the students are proficient in math and literacy. The school district will purchase the NovaNET or STARS Suites web-based software to be used in this multifaceted program.	Rick Gales	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administrative Staff</li> <li>Computers</li> <li>Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State -281) - Purchased Services: \$7,000.00 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$7,000.00

Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Equity Action Type: Technology Inclusion				
All students in the Greenland High School will be provided with an enriched and accelerated educational program which will be supplemented by the purchased of the Web-based Renaissance Learning Accelerated Reading program. This will be used in the computer labs, regular classes, special education classes or the media center.[\$1801.75] Action Type: AIP/IRI Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Special Education Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Carolyn Leonard	Start: 07/01/2010 End: 06/30/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers</li> <li>• School Library</li> <li>• Teachers</li> </ul>	NSLA (State -281) - Purchased Services: \$1,801.75 <hr/> ACTION BUDGET: \$1,801.75
Total Budget:				\$8,801.75