

--	--	--

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

Source of Funds Report

BISMARCK SCHOOL DISTRICT
11636 Hwy 84, Bismarck, AR 71929

Source of Funds Report

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

Total Amount Reported: \$320019.63

Generated on September 30, 2014

BISMARCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$44988.14

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$9485.82

Priority 1: Increase Literacy Skills

Goal: Improve instruction in the areas of literacy by grade levels as follows: Implementation of the Common Core Standards in K-4,(Kindergarten and First) vocabulary; (Second) identify and analyze word parts; (Third) Writing in the areas of style and content; and (Fourth) Open Response Literary Reading.

Priority 2: Increase Mathematical Skills

Goal: Improve instruction of identified skill deficiencies in mathematics by grade levels as follows: Implementation of Common Core Standards in grade K-2, (Kindergarten) problem solving strategies; (First) problem solving strategies including multi-step problems,data interpretation- relationships and trends; (Second) problem solving strategies- approaches/procedures, multi-step and data interpretation-relationships and trends; (Third) open response problems dealing with number sense, properties, and operations and measurement; and (Fourth)open response problems dealing with data analysis, statistics, and probability.

Priority 3: Improve Overall Student Wellness

Goal: The Bismarck Elementary School will provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screenings and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$35502.32

Priority 1: Increase Literacy Skills

Goal: Improve instruction in the areas of literacy by grade levels as follows: Implementation of the Common Core Standards in K-4,(Kindergarten and First) vocabulary; (Second) identify and analyze word parts; (Third) Writing in the areas of style and content; and (Fourth) Open Response Literary Reading.

Priority 2: Increase Mathematical Skills

Goal: Improve instruction of identified skill deficiencies in mathematics by grade levels as follows: Implementation of Common Core Standards in grade K-2, (Kindergarten) problem solving strategies; (First) problem solving strategies including multi-step problems,data interpretation- relationships and trends; (Second) problem solving strategies- approaches/procedures, multi-step and data interpretation-relationships and trends; (Third) open response problems dealing with number sense, properties, and operations and measurement; and (Fourth)open response problems dealing with data analysis, statistics, and probability.

Priority 3: Improve Overall Student Wellness

Goal: The Bismarck Elementary School will provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screenings and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

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

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

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

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

BISMARCK HIGH SCHOOL -- \$98324.68

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$15645.71

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: Students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills in the Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy exam.

Priority 3: Wellness

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$68205.93

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: Students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills in the Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy exam.

Priority 3: Wellness

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$6889.71

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: Students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills in the Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy exam.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$7583.33

Priority 2: Mathematics

Goal: Students will demonstrate improvement in mathematical skills. Specifically they will improve in Triangles Open Response, measurements Open Response, Relationships between two and three dimension, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformation on the PARCC Geometry exam. On the PARCC Algebra I exam they will improve in Open Response Solving Equations & Inequalities and Language of Algebra and Linear Functions. Students with disabilities, Hispanic, and LEP students will be the focus during the Academic Resource Period to raise the scores of those sub populations.

BISMARCK MIDDLE SCHOOL -- \$92734.45

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$18427.46

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and literary.

Priority 2: Mathematics

Goal: All students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions.

Priority 3: Wellness

Goal: The Bismarck Middle School will provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$74306.99

Priority 1: Literacy

Goal: All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and literary.

Priority 2: Mathematics

Goal: All students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions.

Priority 3: Wellness

Goal: The Bismarck Middle School will provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

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

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

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

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

BISMARCK SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$83972.36

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$14555.37

Priority 1: Administrative Support

Goal: Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state

programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$67230.35

Priority 1: Administrative Support

Goal: Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$2129.17

Priority 1: Administrative Support

Goal: Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$57.47

Priority 1: Administrative Support

Goal: Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.

BISMARCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- \$44988.14

Source of Funds

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$9485.82

Priority 1: Increase Literacy Skills

1. Kindergarten: DIBELS
2. First Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 40% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 58% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2013, 58.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS. In 2013, 70% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS
3. Second Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile of the reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 57.4% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS. In 2013, 77.8% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS
4. Third Grade: Benchmark In 2014, 82% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark

Supporting Data:

Test. 86% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 75% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 36% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2013, 74% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 73.9% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 67.4% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 30% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2010, 76% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 77% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 66% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 20% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 75% of the Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2011, 81% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark

Exam. 78% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 82% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 28% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 100% of the Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. In 2012 K-4 is Achieving in Literacy while needing improvement in White and Students with Disabilities. We are a Needs Improvement school in math achievement in all areas. All students at 86.52 and our Targeted Achievement Gap Group at 81.55. Our ESEA groups all needed improvement except Students with Disabilities. We will work on writing (persuasive) and reading comprehension. In math we will focus on fluency and place value as well as problem solving. Third Grade SAT 10/ITBS In 2009, 36.6% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2010, 54% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 64.9% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 45.9% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. Elementary met standards for Literacy in all subpopulations for 2010-11 and for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Elementary is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.56% with 75.08% for TAGG. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and literacy.

5. Fourth Grade: Benchmark Fourth Grade Benchmark Exam In 2014, 78% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 80% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 62.5% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP

population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2013, 75.8% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 78.6 of the caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 67.5% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2010, 84% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 85% of the caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 76% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in open-response content reading and open-response writing content and style. In 2011, 79% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Exam. 80% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 25% of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 66%of Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. Fourth Grade SAT 10/ITBS In 2009, 66% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2010, 74% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 54.2% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. In Language, 54.2% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Elementary met standards for Literacy in all subpopulations for 2010-11. Elementary is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for

all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.56% with 75.08% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013 all students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and literary.

Goal	Improve instruction in the areas of literacy by grade levels as follows: Implementation of the Common Core Standards in K-4,(Kindergarten and First) vocabulary; (Second) identify and analyze word parts; (Third) Writing in the areas of style and content; and (Fourth) Open Response Literary Reading.
Benchmark	At the end of the 13/14 school year, 93% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the 3rd grade Literacy Benchmark. At the end of the 13/14 school year, 93% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the 4th grade Literacy Benchmark. In order to meet proficiency in 2013/14 BES will prioritize and work on writing in the content area and vocabulary.
Benchmark	Economically Disadvantaged students in the 3rd and 4th grades will score 94% in Literacy on the 2013/14 Benchmark Assessment. Interventions such as smaller classroom numbers an extra computer lab for student activities and the adoption of a new phonics program. These will be implemented to increase student achievement.

Intervention: Implement a state initiated balanced literacy program to improve student achievement. At the end of the 2013/2014 school year, the evidence of an interventions impact on student achievement had not been totally collected. The 2014/15 school year will be used as a baseline. Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will be implemented.

Scientific Based Research: Teaching All Students to Read in School - Florida Center for Reading Research; Joseph Torgesen. Reading Programs That Work - John Schacter. Literacy Models in ... Reading First Schools - Executive Summary of Oregon Reading First. Responsiveness to Instruction: A Framework for Providing Effective Literacy Instruction - ERIC 2009. Using Assessment for Instruction - International Center for Leadership in Education. Achieving AYP Using State Specific Curriculum Matrix Data. - ICLE. From Needs Assessment to Strategic Action - Raymond McNulty and Timothy Ott. Assisting the Struggling Learner - Dr. Willard R. Daggett, Evelyn Arroyo, and Larry Gloeckler.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funding will be used to employ a 0.5 FTE paraprofessional, Jill	Lana Hughes, Federal Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Computers - Teachers	NSLA (State-281) \$2,308.91 - Employee Benefits:

Frazier, to provide instructional assistance with a focus on Literacy skills in a computer laboratory setting. Action Type: Technology Inclusion				ACTION BUDGET: \$2,308.91
Total Budget:				\$2,308.91

Priority 2: Increase Mathematical Skills

1. Kindergarten: MAT 8/ITBS In 2011, 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the MAT 8. In 2012, 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the MAT 8. In 2013, 72.9% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS.
2. First Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 44% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the SAT 10. In 2013, 61.1% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2014, 75% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS.
3. Second Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math problem solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math problem solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 64.7% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2013, 65% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2014, 69% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS.
4. Third Grade: Benchmark In 2010, 86% of the combined population scored at or above the proficient level on the math portion of Benchmark Exam. 100% of the Hispanic students (4 students were tested) scored at or above the proficient level. 85% of the Caucasian students scored at or above the proficient level. 83% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above the proficient level. 100% of the LEP students (3 students were tested) scored at or above the proficient level. 20% of the Students with Disabilities (5 students were tested) scored at the proficient level. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response

Supporting Data:

geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. In 2011, 92% of the combined population scored at or above the proficient level on the Math portion of the Benchmark Exam. 90% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 90% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 43% of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 100% of Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in open-response geometry, open-response measurement, and open-response data analysis and probability. SAT 10/ITBS In 2010, 63.5% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Math Problem Solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 60.8% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2014, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with

74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2014, 66% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. 2014 Elementary was classified as a

Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% and growth at 45.54% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2014, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% with 45.54% for TAGG.

5. Fourth Grade: Benchmark In 2010, 65% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Math portion of the Benchmark Test. 67% of Hispanics scored at or above proficient (6 students were tested). 75% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 65% of Socio Economic Deprived students scored at or above proficient. 33% of LEP students scored at or above proficient (3 students were tested). 38% of Students with Disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified area for the combined population was the Open Response Measurement. The lowest identified area for the LEP population was the Open Response Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified area for the IEP students was the Open Response Measurement. In 2011, 85% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Math portion of the Benchmark Exam. 85% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 80% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 41% of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 83% of Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in all open response sections. Fourth Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2009, 63.2% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Math Problem Solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2010, 65.4% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Math Problem Solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 68.1% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2012, 65.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with

74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2012, 65.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2012, 65.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. 2014 2014 Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% and growth at 45.54% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2014, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% with 45.54% for TAGG.

Goal

Improve instruction of identified skill deficiencies in mathematics by grade levels as follows: Implementation of Common Core Standards in grade K-2,

(Kindergarten) problem solving strategies; (First) problem solving strategies including multi-step problems, data interpretation- relationships and trends; (Second) problem solving strategies-approaches/procedures, multi-step and data interpretation-relationships and trends; (Third) open response problems dealing with number sense, properties, and operations and measurement; and (Fourth) open response problems dealing with data analysis, statistics, and probability.

Benchmark At the end of the 13/14 school year, 92% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the 3rd grade Math Benchmark. At the end of the 13/14 school year, 84% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the fourth grade Math Benchmark

Intervention: Implement a standards based math model to improve student achievement in mathematics.				
Scientific Based Research: "Reflections on "Multisensory Mathematics for Children with Mild Disabilities." - Scott, Kristin S. "Implementing Standards Based Mathematics Instruction" - Gay McTige and Grant Wiggins.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funding will be used to employ a 0.5 FTE paraprofessional, Jill Frazier, to provide instructional assistance with a focus on mathematical skills in a computer laboratory setting Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lana Hughes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Administrative Staff - Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - \$2,308.92 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$2,308.92
Total Budget:				\$2,308.92

Priority 3: Improve Overall Student Wellness

Supporting Data:

1. Body Mass Index Data for the 2012-2013 School Year: of the 336 student population of Bismarck Elementary, 332 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 32% of the males and 34.4% of the females were at risk of being overweight.
2. Body Mass Index Data for the 2011-2012 school year: of the 467 student population of Bismarck Elementary School, 363 students were

assessed. Of the students assessed, 39.7% of the males and 35.8% of the females were at risk of being overweight.

3. Body Mass Index Data for the 2010-2011 school year: of the 465 student population of Bismarck Elementary School, 363 were assessed. Of the students assessed, 38.3% of the males and 32.1% of the females were at risk of being overweight.
4. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2012-2013 school year: 35% paid, 9% reduced, 56% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2011-2012 school year: 37.75% paid, 12.83% reduced, 52.40% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2010-2011 school year: 37.24% paid, 13.75% reduced, 48.99% free.

Goal The Bismarck Elementary School will provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screenings and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Benchmark There will be a 5% BMI improvement in the general elementary population.

Intervention: Bismarck Elementary School will implement practices to provide opportunities for student to practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage them to make healthy food and physical activity choices resulting in increased academic performance.

Scientific Based Research: Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Healthy Eating (June 14, 1996/Vol. 45/No. RR-9); Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity (March 7, 1997/Vol. 46/No. RR-6)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA will fund 1.0 FTE Nurse for the Bismarck School District to be housed at the elementary school. Responsibilities will be conducting risk assessments on students and report the results to parents. The nurse will serve as a resource to the district School Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Committee. They will work closely with staff, parents and the school counselors to address the needs of at	Lana Hughes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	District Staff	NSLA (State-281) \$4,867.99 - Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$4,867.99

risk students. This nursing position is over and above the state standards. Jamie Ruffin,RN Action Type: Equity Action Type: Wellness				
Total Budget:				\$4,867.99

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$35502.32

Priority 1: Increase Literacy Skills

1. Kindergarten: DIBELS
2. First Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 40% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 58% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2013, 58.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS. In 2013, 70% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS
3. Second Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile of the reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 57.4% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS. In 2013, 77.8% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Reading on the ITBS
4. Third Grade: Benchmark In 2014, 82% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 86% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 75% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 36% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2013, 74% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 73.9% of the Caucasian students scored at or above

Supporting Data:

proficient. 67.4% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 30% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2010, 76% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 77% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 66% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 20% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 75% of the Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2011, 81% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Exam. 78% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 82% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 28% of the students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 100% of the Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. In 2012 K-4 is Achieving in Literacy while needing improvement in White and Students with Disabilities. We are a Needs Improvement school in math achievement in all areas. All students at 86.52 and our Targeted Achievement Gap Group at 81.55. Our ESEA groups all needed improvement except Students with Disabilities. We will work on writing (persuasive) and reading comprehension. In math we will focus on fluency and place value as well as problem solving. Third Grade SAT 10/ITBS In 2009, 36.6% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2010, 54% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension

portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 64.9% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 45.9% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. Elementary met standards for Literacy in all subpopulations for 2010-11 and for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Elementary is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.56% with 75.08% for TAGG. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and literary.

5. Fourth Grade: Benchmark Fourth Grade Benchmark Exam In 2014, 78% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 80% of the caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 62.5% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2013, 75.8% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 78.6 of the caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 67.5% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. In 2010, 84% of the combined population

scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Test. 85% of the caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 76% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response content reading and open-response writing style. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in open-response content reading and open-response writing content and style. In 2011, 79% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Literacy portion of the Benchmark Exam. 80% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 25% of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 66% of Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. Fourth Grade SAT 10/ITBS In 2009, 66% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2010, 74% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 54.2% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. In Language, 54.2% scored at or above the 50th percentile. Elementary met standards for Literacy in all subpopulations for 2010-11. Elementary is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.56% with 75.08% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013 all students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and literacy.

Goal	Improve instruction in the areas of literacy by grade levels as follows: Implementation of the Common Core Standards in K-4,(Kindergarten and First) vocabulary; (Second) identify and analyze word parts; (Third) Writing in the areas of style and content; and (Fourth) Open Response Literary Reading.
------	--

Benchmark	At the end of the 13/14 school year, 93% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the 3rd grade Literacy Benchmark. At the end of the 13/14 school year, 93% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the 4th grade Literacy Benchmark. In order to meet proficiency in 2013/14 BES will prioritize and work on writing in the content area and vocabulary.
Benchmark	Economically Disadvantaged students in the 3rd and 4th grades will score 94% in Literacy on the 2013/14 Benchmark Assessment. Interventions such as smaller classroom numbers an extra computer lab for student activities and the adoption of a new phonics program. These will be implemented to increase student achievement.

Intervention: Implement a state initiated balanced literacy program to improve student achievement. At the end of the 2013/2014 school year, the evidence of an interventions impact on student achievement had not been totally collected. The 2014/15 school year will be used as a baseline. Protocols for evaluating and adjusting programs will be implemented.

Scientific Based Research: Teaching All Students to Read in School - Florida Center for Reading Research; Joseph Torgesen. Reading Programs That Work - John Schacter. Literacy Models in ... Reading First Schools - Executive Summary of Oregon Reading First. Responsiveness to Instruction: A Framework for Providing Effective Literacy Instruction - ERIC 2009. Using Assessment for Instruction - International Center for Leadership in Education. Achieving AYP Using State Specific Curriculum Matrix Data. - ICLE. From Needs Assessment to Strategic Action - Raymond McNulty and Timothy Ott. Assisting the Struggling Learner - Dr. Willard R. Daggett, Evelyn Arroyo, and Larry Gloeckler.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funding will be used to employ a 0.5 FTE paraprofessional, Jill Frazier, to provide instructional assistance with a focus on Literacy skills in a computer laboratory setting. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lana Hughes, Federal Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Computers - Teachers	NSLA (State-281) \$6,507.68 - Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$6,507.68
Total Budget:				\$6,507.68

Priority 2: Increase Mathematical Skills

Supporting Data: 1. Kindergarten: MAT 8/ITBS In 2011, 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the MAT 8. In 2012, 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the MAT 8. In 2013, 72.9% of the

combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS.

2. First Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 44% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math portion of the SAT 10. In 2013, 61.1% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2014, 75% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS.
3. Second Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2011, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math problem solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the math problem solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 64.7% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2013, 65% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2014, 69% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS.
4. Third Grade: Benchmark In 2010, 86% of the combined population scored at or above the proficient level on the math portion of Benchmark Exam. 100% of the Hispanic students (4 students were tested) scored at or above the proficient level. 85% of the Caucasian students scored at or above the proficient level. 83% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above the proficient level. 100% of the LEP students (3 students were tested) scored at or above the proficient level. 20% of the Students with Disabilities (5 students were tested) scored at the proficient level. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the Hispanic population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. The lowest identified areas for the LEP population were open-response geometry and open-response measurement. In 2011, 92% of the combined population scored at or above the proficient level on the Math portion of the Benchmark Exam. 90% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 90% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 43% of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 100% of Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in open-response geometry, open-response measurement, and open-response data analysis and probability. SAT

10/ITBS In 2010, 63.5% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Math Problem Solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2012, 60.8% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2014, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis,

measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2013, 83.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2014, 66% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. 2014 Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% and growth at 45.54% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2014, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% with 45.54% for TAGG.

5. Fourth Grade: Benchmark In 2010, 65% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Math portion of the Benchmark Test. 67% of Hispanics scored at or above proficient (6 students were tested). 75% of Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 65% of Socio Economic Deprived students scored at or above proficient.

33% of LEP students scored at or above proficient (3 students were tested). 38% of Students with Disabilities scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified area for the combined population was the Open Response Measurement. The lowest identified area for the LEP population was the Open Response Numbers and Operations. The lowest identified area for the IEP students was the Open Response Measurement. In 2011, 85% of the combined population scored at or above proficient on the Math portion of the Benchmark Exam. 85% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 80% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. 41% of students with disabilities scored at or above proficient. 83% of Hispanic students scored at or above proficient. Analysis of three-year data shows a weakness in all open response sections. Fourth Grade: SAT 10/ITBS In 2009, 63.2% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Math Problem Solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2010, 65.4% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Math Problem Solving portion of the SAT 10. In 2011, 68.1% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. In 2012, 65.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2012, 65.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis,

measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. In 2012, 65.3% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile in Total Math on the ITBS. Elementary met standards for math in all subpopulations for 2010-11. They were classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Three year average for all students in math is 88.07% with 83.45% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.58% with 77.59% for TAGG. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.94% with 74.76% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2012-2013, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. 2014 2014 Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% and growth at 45.54% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2014, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. Elementary was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% with 45.54% for TAGG.

Goal	Improve instruction of identified skill deficiencies in mathematics by grade levels as follows: Implementation of Common Core Standards in grade K-2, (Kindergarten) problem solving strategies; (First) problem solving strategies including multi-step problems, data interpretation- relationships and trends; (Second) problem solving strategies-approaches/procedures, multi-step and data interpretation-relationships and trends; (Third) open response problems dealing with number sense, properties, and operations and measurement; and (Fourth) open response problems dealing with data analysis, statistics, and probability.
Benchmark	At the end of the 13/14 school year, 92% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the 3rd grade Math Benchmark. At the end of the 13/14 school year, 84% of the combined population scored proficient/advanced on the fourth grade Math Benchmark

Intervention: Implement a standards based math model to improve student achievement in mathematics.

Scientific Based Research: "Reflections on "Multisensory Mathematics for Children with Mild

Disabilities." - Scott, Kristin S. "Implementing Standards Based Mathematics Instruction" - Gay McTige and Grant Wiggins.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funding will be used to employ a 0.5 FTE paraprofessional, Jill Frazier, to provide instructional assistance with a focus on mathematical skills in a computer laboratory setting Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lana Hughes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Administrative Staff - Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - \$6,507.68 Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$6,507.68
Total Budget:				\$6,507.68

Priority 3: Improve Overall Student Wellness

- Supporting Data:
1. Body Mass Index Data for the 2012-2013 School Year: of the 336 student population of Bismarck Elementary, 332 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 32% of the males and 34.4% of the females were at risk of being overweight.
 2. Body Mass Index Data for the 2011-2012 school year: of the 467 student population of Bismarck Elementary School, 363 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 39.7% of the males and 35.8% of the females were at risk of being overweight.
 3. Body Mass Index Data for the 2010-2011 school year: of the 465 student population of Bismarck Elementary School, 363 were assessed. Of the students assessed, 38.3% of the males and 32.1% of the females were at risk of being overweight.
 4. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2012-2013 school year: 35% paid, 9% reduced, 56% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2011-2012 school year: 37.75% paid, 12.83% reduced, 52.40% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2010-2011 school year: 37.24% paid, 13.75% reduced, 48.99% free.

Goal The Bismarck Elementary School will provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the

average BMI on routine annual student screenings and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.

Benchmark There will be a 5% BMI improvement in the general elementary population.

Intervention: Bismarck Elementary School will implement practices to provide opportunities for student to practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage them to make healthy food and physical activity choices resulting in increased academic performance.

Scientific Based Research: Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Healthy Eating (June 14, 1996/Vol. 45/No. RR-9); Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity (March 7, 1997/Vol. 46/No. RR-6)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA will fund 1.0 FTE Nurse for the Bismarck School District to be housed at the elementary school. Responsibilities will be conducting risk assessments on students and report the results to parents. The nurse will serve as a resource to the district School Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Committee. They will work closely with staff, parents and the school counselors to address the needs of at risk students. This nursing position is over and above the state standards. Jamie Ruffin,RN Action Type: Equity Action Type: Wellness	Lana Hughes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	District Staff	NSLA (State-281) \$22,486.96 - Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$22,486.96
Total Budget:				\$22,486.96

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) - Purchased Services -- \$0

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

BISMARCK HIGH SCHOOL -- \$98324.68**Source of Funds**

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$15645.71

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

1. Literacy- 11th grade exam: 2014_ Number tested and percent of students scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 85 students were tested and 84.71% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Caucasians: 82 Students were tested and 85.37% scored either proficient or advanced; African American: 2 students were tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 7 were tested and 42.86% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 45 students were tested and 82.22% scored either Proficient or Advanced. 2013 - Number tested and percent of students scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 71 Students were tested and 83% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Caucasian: 67 were tested and 82% scored at either Proficient or Advanced; Hispanic: 3 students were tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Asian: 1 student was tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 35 were tested and 74% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 3 students were tested and 0% scored either Proficient or Advanced. 2012 - # Tested and Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 74 were tested and 89% scored either Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Hispanic: 3 students were tested and 100% scored Proficient or Advanced; Caucasian: 71 were tested and 89% scored Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 45 were tested and 89% scored Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 9 were tested and 33% scored Proficient or Advanced.
2. In 2012, on the IOWA Test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 92 tested, Vocabulary was the weakest identified area. In 2011, on the IOWA Test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 78 tested, Reading Comprehension was the weakest identified area. In 2010, on the Stanford test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 89 tested, Reading Comprehension and Language Expression were the weakest identified

areas.

3. 1. ACT Report in English: In 2014, 58 students tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students tested with a 21.5 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students tested with a 20.4 average which was above the state average. 2. ACT Report in Reading: In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 21.9 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 22.0 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. 3. ACT Report in Science In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 20.8 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 21.4 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. 5. ACT Composite Report In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 20.9 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 21.5 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.7 average which was above the state average.
4. Graduation Rate: In 2013, 87.95% In 2012, 88.46% In 2011, 88.5% Attendance Rate: In 2013, 94.43% In 2012, 94.08% In 2011, 92.8% Drop Out Rate: in 2011, 2% In 2009, 4% In 2008, 2%

Goal	Students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills in the Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy exam.
Benchmark	At the end of the 2013-2014 school year 84.71% of the 11th grade taking the literacy exam were proficient or advanced. By the end of the 2014-2015 school year our goal is to meet or exceed the AMO of 77.18%.

Intervention: Implement State Initiated Balanced Literacy Program to Improve Student Achievement.

Scientific Based Research: (RESEARCH: (1) The College Writer. VanderMey, Meyer, VanRys, Kemper, Sebranek. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York. 2004. (2) Teaching Writing-Balancing Process and Product. Tompkins, Gail. MacMillan Publishing Co. New York. 1994. (3) Writing Reminders--Tools, Tips, and Techniques. Burke, Jim. Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH. 2003.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to employ an half-time .50 FTE instructional paraprofessional to assist low	Larry Newsom, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Computers - Performance Assessments	NSLA (State-281) - \$2,402.00 Employee Benefits:

performing and at-risk students in literacy. These targeted students require extra assistance to become successful in passing the PARCC exam and other assessments. Assistance is also required to help ensure that the students graduate. Ellen Draper Action Type: Equity				ACTION BUDGET: \$2,402.00
NSLA funds will be used to support the purchase of NWEA which will be utilized to improve student achievement. A .43 FTE person will be employed to support the system through preparation of all materials. This person will prepare all interim assessments and technology services to help teachers and administrators effectively meet the needs of all students. This person will proof all tests to make sure they are problem free and ready for students. Name: Latavia Tart Action Type: Alignment Action Type:	Ellen Coleman	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Computers - Performance Assessments	NSLA (State-281) - \$1,417.57 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$1,417.57

Technology Inclusion				
In keeping with approved activities, NSLA Funds will be used to employ a .56 FTE highly qualified teacher, Donna Hays, to provide services 4 days per week to non English speaking students throughout the school year. These services will increase achievement of non English speaking students in the content areas of reading and math. Monies will be used to pay for salary, benefits, materials, supplies, and professional development. These funds will be used to hire a .10 Spanish language interpreter to assist parents and students with the communication barrier. The district does not receive any Title III money. Action Type: Equity	Lana Hughes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - \$4,547.27 Employee Benefits: ACTION BUDGET: \$4,547.27
Total Budget:				\$8,366.84

Priority 3: Wellness

Supporting Data:

1. Body Mass Index Data for the 2013-2014 school year: of the 300 student population and 33 in a grade for which BMI is required, 33 were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percentage of students overweight and obese: males - 18.2% were

overweight and 30.3% were obese; females - 20% were overweight and 20% were obese. Body Mass Index Data for the 2012-2013 school year: of the 300 student population and 82 in a grade for which BMI is required, 82 were assessed. Of the students assessed the following represents the percentage of students overweight and obese: males - 69.6% were overweight and 17.4% were obese; females - 58.3% were overweight and 13.9% were obese. Body Mass Index Data for the 2010-2011 school year: of the 300 student population and 61 in a grade for which BMI is required, 61 were assessed. Of the students assessed the following represents the percentage of students overweight and obese: males - 19.2% were overweight and 19.2% were obese. For females the percentage of students overweight was 14.3% and 31.4% were obese.

2. The following data was found in the Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment: In the Average Age of First Marijuana: The age of first use of marijuana showed a drop 13.9 in 2011-12 to 13.7 in 2012-13 and a drop to 13 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Cigarettes: The age of first use of cigarettes dropped from 13.1 in 2011-12 to 12.6 in 2012-13 and rose to age 14 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Alcohol: The age decreased from 13.8 in 2011-12 and dropped to 13.6 in 2012-13. The age in 2013 was 15.5. In the Average of First School Suspension: The age of first school suspension increased from 13.0 in 2011-12 to 13.4 in 2012-2013. In 2013-2014 8 students were suspended 1-5 times. In the Average of First Been Arrested: The age of first being arrested increased from 14.5 in 2011-12 14.8 in 2012-2013 and increased to 16 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Carried a Gun: The average of first carrying a gun decreased from 14.4 in 2011-12 to 13.2 in 2012-13 and decreased to age 10 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Attacked to Harm: The age of first attacked to harm decreased from 13.6 in 2011-12 to 13.1 in 2012-13 and decreased to age 10 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Belonged to a Gang: The age of first belonging to a gang decreased from 13.1 in 2011-12 to 12.6 in 2012-13 and increased to 17 in 2013-2014.
3. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2014-2015 school year: 59% of the students qualified for free or reduced meal prices. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2013-2014 school year: 57% of the students qualified for free or reduced meal prices. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2012-2013 school year: 57.5% qualified for free or reduced meal prices.

Goal

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

Benchmark By the 2014-2015 school year, there will be a decrease in the average body mass index for students by 1/2% as evaluated by the annual Body Mass Index Screening.

Intervention: Bismarck High School will implement practices to provide opportunities for students to practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage them to make healthy food and physical activity choices resulting in increased academic performance.				
Scientific Based Research: Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Healthy Eating (June 14, 1996/Vol. 45. no R-9); Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity (March 7, 1997/ vol. 46/ o. RR-6)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA will fund 1.0 FTE Nurse for the Bismarck School District to be housed at the high school. Responsibilities will be conducting risk assessments on students and report the results to parents. The nurse will serve as a resource to the district School Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Committee. They will work closely with staff, parents and the school counselors to address the needs of at risk students. This nursing position is over and above the state standards. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Susan Stewart	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	District Staff	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$7,278.87 ACTION BUDGET: \$7,278.87
Total Budget:				\$7,278.87

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$68205.93

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data: 1. Literacy- 11th grade exam: 2014_ Number tested and percent of students scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 85 students were tested and 84.71% scored either Proficient or Advanced;

Caucasians: 82 Students were tested and 85.37% scored either proficient or advanced; African American: 2 students were tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 7 were tested and 42.86% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 45 students were tested and 82.22% scored either Proficient or Advanced. 2013 - Number tested and percent of students scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 71 Students were tested and 83% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Caucasian: 67 were tested and 82% scored at either Proficient or Advanced; Hispanic: 3 students were tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Asian: 1 student was tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 35 were tested and 74% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 3 students were tested and 0% scored either Proficient or Advanced. 2012 - # Tested and Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 74 were tested and 89% scored either Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Hispanic: 3 students were tested and 100% scored Proficient or Advanced; Caucasian: 71 were tested and 89% scored Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 45 were tested and 89% scored Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 9 were tested and 33% scored Proficient or Advanced.

2. In 2012, on the IOWA Test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 92 tested, Vocabulary was the weakest identified area. In 2011, on the IOWA Test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 78 tested, Reading Comprehension was the weakest identified area. In 2010, on the Stanford test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 89 tested, Reading Comprehension and Language Expression were the weakest identified areas.
3. 1. ACT Report in English: In 2014, 58 students tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students tested with a 21.5 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students tested with a 20.4 average which was above the state average. 2. ACT Report in Reading: In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 21.9 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 22.0 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. 3. ACT Report in Science In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 20.8 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 21.4 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. 5. ACT Composite Report In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 20.9 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 21.5 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a

20.7 average which was above the state average.

4. Graduation Rate: In 2013, 87.95% In 2012, 88.46% In 2011, 88.5%
Attendance Rate: In 2013, 94.43% In 2012, 94.08% In 2011, 92.8%
Drop Out Rate: in 2011, 2% In 2009, 4% In 2008, 2%

Goal	Students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills in the Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy exam.
Benchmark	At the end of the 2013-2014 school year 84.71% of the 11th grade taking the literacy exam were proficient or advanced. By the end of the 2014-2015 school year our goal is to meet or exceed the AMO of 77.18%.

Intervention: Implement State Initiated Balanced Literacy Program to Improve Student Achievement.

Scientific Based Research: (RESEARCH: (1) The College Writer. VanderMey, Meyer, VanRys, Kemper, Sebranek. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York. 2004. (2) Teaching Writing-Balancing Process and Product. Tompkins, Gail. MacMillan Publishing Co. New York. 1994. (3) Writing Reminders--Tools, Tips, and Techniques. Burke, Jim. Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH. 2003.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to employ an half-time .50 FTE instructional paraprofessional to assist low performing and at-risk students in literacy. These targeted students require extra assistance to become successful in passing the PARCC exam and other assessments. Assistance is also required to help ensure that the students graduate. Ellen Draper Action Type: Equity	Larry Newsom, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Computers - Performance Assessments	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$7,034.09 ACTION BUDGET: \$7,034.09

NSLA funds will be used to support the purchase of NWEA which will be utilized to improve student achievement. A .43 FTE person will be employed to support the system through preparation of all materials. This person will prepare all interim assessments and technology services to help teachers and administrators effectively meet the needs of all students. This person will proof all tests to make sure they are problem free and ready for students. Name: Latavia Tart Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Ellen Coleman	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Computers - Performance Assessments	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$6,547.67 ACTION BUDGET: \$6,547.67
In keeping with approved activities, NSLA Funds will be used to employ a .56 FTE highly qualified teacher, Donna Hays, to provide services 4 days per week to non English speaking students throughout the	Lana Hughes	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: \$21,003.53 ACTION BUDGET: \$21,003.53

school year. These services will increase achievement of non English speaking students in the content areas of reading and math. Monies will be used to pay for salary, benefits, materials, supplies, and professional development. These funds will be used to hire a .10 Spanish language interpreter to assist parents and students with the communication barrier. The district does not receive any Title III money. Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$34,585.29

Priority 3: Wellness

- Supporting Data:
1. Body Mass Index Data for the 2013-2014 school year: of the 300 student population and 33 in a grade for which BMI is required, 33 were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percentage of students overweight and obese: males - 18.2% were overweight and 30.3% were obese; females - 20% were overweight and 20% were obese. Body Mass Index Data for the 2012-2013 school year: of the 300 student population and 82 in a grade for which BMI is required, 82 were assessed. Of the students assessed the following represents the percentage of students overweight and obese: males - 69.6% were overweight and 17.4% were obese; females - 58.3% were overweight and 13.9% were obese. Body Mass Index Data for the 2010-2011 school year: of the 300 student population and 61 in a grade for which BMI is required, 61 were assessed. Of the students assessed the following represents the percentage of students overweight and

obese: males - 19.2% were overweight and 19.2% were obese. For females the percentage of students overweight was 14.3% and 31.4% were obese.

2. The following data was found in the Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment: In the Average Age of First Marijuana: The age of first use of marijuana showed a drop 13.9 in 2011-12 to 13.7 in 2012-13 and a drop to 13 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Cigarettes: The age of first use of cigarettes dropped from 13.1 in 2011-12 to 12.6 in 2012-13 and rose to age 14 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Alcohol: The age decreased from 13.8 in 2011-12 and dropped to 13.6 in 2012-13. The age in 2013 was 15.5. In the Average of First School Suspension: The age of first school suspension increased from 13.0 in 2011-12 to 13.4 in 2012-2013. In 2013-2014 8 students were suspended 1-5 times. In the Average of First Been Arrested: The age of first being arrested increased from 14.5 in 2011-12 14.8 in 2012-2013 and increased to 16 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Carried a Gun: The average of first carrying a gun decreased from 14.4 in 2011-12 to 13.2 in 2012-13 and decreased to age 10 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Attacked to Harm: The age of first attacked to harm decreased from 13.6 in 2011-12 to 13.1 in 2012-13 and decreased to age 10 in 2013-2014. In the Average Age of First Belonged to a Gang: The age of first belonging to a gang decreased from 13.1 in 2011-12 to 12.6 in 2012-13 and increased to 17 in 2013-2014.
3. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2014-2015 school year: 59% of the students qualified for free or reduced meal prices. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2013-2014 school year: 57% of the students qualified for free or reduced meal prices. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2012-2013 school year: 57.5% qualified for free or reduced meal prices.

Goal	The Bismarck High School will provide support for students in making healthy lifestyle choices by implementing systems to aid in decreasing the average BMI on routine annual student screening and increasing collaboration between all segments of the school community in support of positive lifestyle choices.
Benchmark	By the 2014-2015 school year, there will be a decrease in the average body mass index for students by 1/2% as evaluated by the annual Body Mass Index Screening.

Intervention: Bismarck High School will implement practices to provide opportunities for students to practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage them to make healthy food and physical activity choices resulting in increased academic performance.

Scientific Based Research: Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Healthy Eating (June 14, 1996/Vol. 45. no R-9); Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity (March 7, 1997/ vol. 46/ o. RR-6)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA will fund 1.0 FTE Nurse for the Bismarck School District to be housed at the high school. Responsibilities will be conducting risk assessments on students and report the results to parents. The nurse will serve as a resource to the district School Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Committee. They will work closely with staff, parents and the school counselors to address the needs of at risk students. This nursing position is over and above the state standards. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Wellness	Susan Stewart	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	District Staff	NSLA (State-281) \$33,620.64 - Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$33,620.64
Total Budget:				\$33,620.64

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- \$6889.71

Priority 1: Literacy

- Supporting Data:
1. Literacy- 11th grade exam: 2014_ Number tested and percent of students scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 85 students were tested and 84.71% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Caucasians: 82 Students were tested and 85.37% scored either proficient or advanced; African American: 2 students were tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 7 were tested and 42.86% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 45 students were tested and 82.22% scored either Proficient or Advanced. 2013 - Number tested and percent of students scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 71 Students were tested and 83% scored either Proficient or Advanced;

Caucasian: 67 were tested and 82% scored at either Proficient or Advanced; Hispanic: 3 students were tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Asian: 1 student was tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 35 were tested and 74% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 3 students were tested and 0% scored either Proficient or Advanced. 2012 - # Tested and Percent of Students Scoring Proficient/Advanced: Combined Population: 74 were tested and 89% scored either Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Hispanic: 3 students were tested and 100% scored Proficient or Advanced; Caucasian: 71 were tested and 89% scored Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 45 were tested and 89% scored Proficient or Advanced; Students with Disabilities: 9 were tested and 33% scored Proficient or Advanced.

2. In 2012, on the IOWA Test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 92 tested, Vocabulary was the weakest identified area. In 2011, on the IOWA Test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 78 tested, Reading Comprehension was the weakest identified area. In 2010, on the Stanford test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 89 tested, Reading Comprehension and Language Expression were the weakest identified areas.
3. 1. ACT Report in English: In 2014, 58 students tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students tested with a 21.5 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students tested with a 20.4 average which was above the state average. 2. ACT Report in Reading: In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 21.9 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 22.0 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. 3. ACT Report in Science In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 20.8 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 21.4 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.5 average which was above the state average. 5. ACT Composite Report In 2014, 58 students were tested with a 20.9 average which was above the state average. In 2013, 64 students were tested with a 21.5 average which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with a 20.7 average which was above the state average.
4. Graduation Rate: In 2013, 87.95% In 2012, 88.46% In 2011, 88.5% Attendance Rate: In 2013, 94.43% In 2012, 94.08% In 2011, 92.8% Drop Out Rate: in 2011, 2% In 2009, 4% In 2008, 2%

Goal

Students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills in the Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy exam.

Benchmark At the end of the 2013-2014 school year 84.71% of the 11th grade taking the literacy exam were proficient or advanced. By the end of the 2014-2015 school year our goal is to meet or exceed the AMO of 77.18%.

Intervention: Implement State Initiated Balanced Literacy Program to Improve Student Achievement.				
Scientific Based Research: (RESEARCH: (1) The College Writer. VanderMey, Meyer, VanRys, Kemper, Sebranek. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York. 2004. (2) Teaching Writing-Balancing Process and Product. Tompkins, Gail. MacMillan Publishing Co. New York. 1994. (3) Writing Reminders--Tools, Tips, and Techniques. Burke, Jim. Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH. 2003.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to purchase a classroom set of laptop computers and a transport cart which will be used for instructional enhancement in all curriculum areas. These computers will be used for instruction, remediation and testing. 30 laptops @ 525.00 = \$15,750.00. Audio/Visual technology will be incorporated into all classrooms and curriculum areas to enhance student comprehension and to address a variety of learning styles. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Lary Newsom, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Computers - District Staff - Outside Consultants	NSLA (State-281) - Materials \$6,889.71 & Supplies: ACTION BUDGET: \$6,889.71
Total Budget:				\$6,889.71

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$7583.33

Priority 2: Mathematics

Supporting Data:

1. EOC-Algebra I Exam 2014: # tests and percent of students scoring proficient: Combines: 49 students were tested and 86% scored either proficient or advanced; Caucasians: 48 students were tested and 86% scored proficient or advanced; Hispanic: 1 student was tested and 100% scored either proficient or advanced; African-American: N/A; American-Indian: N/A; Students with Disabilities: N/A; Economically Disadvantaged: 32 students were tested and 85% scored either proficient or advanced. 2013: # tests and Percent of Students Scoring Proficient: Combined: 55 students were tested and 89% scored either proficient or advanced; Caucasian: 51 students were tested and 88% scored either proficient or advanced; Hispanic: 3 students were tested and 100% scored either proficient or advanced; African-American: N/A; American Indian: 1 was tested and 100% scored either proficient or advanced; Students with Disabilities: 3 students were tested and 88% scored either proficient or advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 35 students were tested and scored either proficient or advanced. EOC-Algebra I Exam 2012: # Tested and Percent of Students Scoring Proficient or Advanced: Combined: 60 students were tested and 78% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Caucasian: 55 were tested and 78% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Hispanic: 5 were tested and 80% scored either Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Students with Disabilities: 2 students were tested and 50% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 45 students were tested and 77% scored either Proficient or Advanced.
2. EOC-Geometry Exam 2014: # Tested and Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced: 13 students were tested and 62% tested either proficient or advanced; Caucasian: 12 students were tested and 58% scored either proficient or advanced; Hispanic: N/A; American Indian: 1 student was tested and 100% scored either proficient or advanced; Students with Disabilities: 2 students were tested and 0% scored either proficient or advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 10 students were tested and 50% scored either proficient or advanced. 2013: # Tested and Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced: Combined Population: 78 students were tested and 77% scored either proficient or advanced; Caucasian: 71 students were tested and 78% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Hispanic: 6 students were tested and 67% scored either proficient or advanced; African American: N/A; Asian: 1 student was tested and 100% scored either proficient or advanced; Students with Disabilities: 2 were tested and 100% scored either proficient or advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 46 were tested and 74% scored either proficient or advanced. EOC-Geometry Exam 2012 - # Tested and Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced: Combined Population: 84 students were tested and 90% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Caucasin: 82 students were tested and 90% scored either proficient or advanced; Hispanic: 1 student was tested and 100% scored either

Proficient or Advanced; African American: N/A; Students with Disabilities: 2 students were tested and 100% scored either Proficient or Advanced; Economically Disadvantaged: 41 students were tested and 85% scored either Proficient or Advanced.

3. In 2012, on the IOWA test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 92 students tested, Computation was the weakest area. In 2011, on the Iowa Tests of Educational Development taken by the ninth graders: Of the 78 students tested, Computation was the weakest area. In 2010, on the Stanford test taken by the ninth graders: Of the 89 tested, Computation was the weakest area.
4. 1. ACT Report in Math: In 2014, 58 students were tested with an average of 20.3 which was above the state average In 2013, 64 students were tested with an average of 20.8 which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with an average of 20.2 which was above the state average. 2. ACT Composite Report In 2013, 64 students were tested with an average of 21.5 which was above the state average. In 2012, 54 students were tested with an average of 20.7 which was above the state average. In 2011, 54 students were tested with an average of 20.1 which was above the state average.
5. Graduation Rate: In 2012, 88.5% In 2011, 88.5% In 2010, 85.5% Attendance Rate: In 2012, 94.08% In 2011, 92.8% In 2010, 91.3% Drop Out Rate: In 2011, 2% In 2010, 4% In 2009, 2%

Goal

Students will demonstrate improvement in mathematical skills. Specifically they will improve in Triangles Open Response, measurements Open Response, Relationships between two and three dimension, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformation on the PARCC Geometry exam. On the PARCC Algebra I exam they will improve in Open Response Solving Equations & Inequalities and Language of Algebra and Linear Functions. Students with disabilities, Hispanic, and LEP students will be the focus during the Academic Resource Period to raise the scores of those sub populations.

Benchmark

At the end of the 2013-2014 school year 86% of the students taking the End of Course Algebra were proficient or advanced. In Geometry 62% students were proficient or advanced. Annually a 3% growth will be shown. At the end of the 2013-2014 school year the AMO for growth in math was 90.70% for all students; however, the students scored 87.66%. The subpopulation AMO was 86.28%; however, the subpopulation scored 77.78%. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, the goal is to meet the AMO growth of 91.73%.

Intervention: Implement State Initiated Balanced Mathematics Program to Improve Student Achievement.

Scientific Based Research: (RESEARCH: Briars, D. J., & Resnick, L. B. (2000). Standards, assessment-and what else? The essential elements of standards-based school improvement [CSE Technical Report 528]. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA.

<http://www.cse.ucla.edu/CRESST/Reports/TECH528.pdf>(1) The Case for Constructivist Classrooms. Brooks, Jacqueline Grennon; Brooks, Martin G. ASCD, Alexandria, VA. 1993. (2) Making Connections. Caine, Renata Nummela; Cain, Geoffrey. Addison Wesley, Menlo Park, CA. 1994. (3) Future Basics: Developing Numerical Power. charles, Randall; Lobato, Joanne. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Ruston, VA. 1998.)

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to purchase technology to enhance and improve instruction in math and scienc. Items included, but not limited to: increased bandwidth, I Pads, TI Smart views, Elmos, Interwrite Pads, and Apple TV. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Larry Newsom	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Administrative Staff - Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - \$7,583.33 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$7,583.33
Total Budget:				\$7,583.33

BISMARCK MIDDLE SCHOOL -- \$92734.45

Source of Funds

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$18427.46

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

- 5th Grade On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 86% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response

Content, and Open Response Literary. 86% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Content, and Open REsponse Literary. 76% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open REsponse Content, and Open REsponse Literary. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 89% of the combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open REsponse Content and Open REsponse Practical. 86% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Content and Open Response Practical. 89% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open REsponse Content and Open Response Practical. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy Exam: 83% of our combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Writing Content and Open Response Writing Style. 80% of caucasian students scored proficient or advanced while other ethnicities scored 100% proficient or advanced. 82% of the economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or advanced.

2. Sixth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 80% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Content, and Open Response Practical. 81% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Content, and Open Response Practical. 76% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Content, and Open Response Practical. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 77% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Content and Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing in Content and Style. 78% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Content and Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing in Content and Style. 60% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Content and Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing in Content and Style. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy exam: 78% of the combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Writing Content and Style. 75% of the caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. 74% of

- the economically disadvantaged students were proficient or advanced.
3. Seventh Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 89% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Content. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Content. 85% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Content. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 89% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Writing Open Response Content and Style. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Writing Open Response Content and Style. 86% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Writing Open Response Content and Style. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy exam: 83% of the combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open response writing content and style domains. 83% of the caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or advanced.
 4. Eighth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 85% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population was Open Response Literary. 84% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population was Open Response Literary. 80% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population was Open Response Literary. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 90% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing, Content, and Style. 90% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing, Content, and Style. 84% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing, Content, and Style. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy Exam: 80% of the combined population scored proficient or advanced. The lowest

identified areas for the combined population were Open-Response Reading Content Passage, Writing Content, and Writing Style. 80% of caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 74% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

5. Fifth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 46% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 50% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 47% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the ITBS. 64% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 65% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Sixth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 49% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 59% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 52% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Priority 1: Increase MATHEMATICS Skills and Performance Seventh Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 59% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 63% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Eighth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th

percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS.

6. 2012 BMS AMO Report In 2012, 5-8 was Achieving in both Literacy and Math. In Literacy: All Students Proficiency performance for 2012 in Literacy was 84.92 (surpassing the AMO of 80.87) and the TAG group performance was 77.6 (surpassing the AMO of 74.11). The 3 year performance in Literacy of the TAG group was 73.23 (did not meet the 3 year performance AMO of 74.11). In Literacy: All Students Growth for 2012 in Literacy was 88.89 (surpassing the AMO of 81.73) and the TAG group growth was 82.58 (surpassing the AMO of 75.95). In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2012 in Math was 83.54 (surpassing the AMO of 80.93) and the TAG group performance was 77.23 (surpassing the AMO of 74.74). In Math: All Students Growth for 2012 in Math was 80.56 (surpassing the AMO of 78.07) and the TAG group growth was 74.16 (surpassing the AMO of 71.87). 2013 BMS AMO Report In 2013, 5-8 was classified as Achieving in Literacy and classified as Needs Improvement in Math. In Literacy: All Students Proficiency performance for 2013 in Literacy was 83.83 (the AMO of 82.61) and the TAG group performance was 76.26 (the AMO of 76.47). In Literacy: All Students Growth for 2013 in Literacy was 85.77 (the AMO of 83.39) and the TAG group growth was 79.56 (the AMO of 78.13). In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2013 in Math was 80.19 (the AMO of 82.67) and the TAG group performance was (the AMO of 77.03). In 2014, 5-8 was rated Needs Improvement Literacy. All Students Proficiency performance for 2014 in Literacy was 79.31% (failing to meet the 84.35% AMO) and the TAG group performance was 72.50 % (failing to meet the AMO of 78.82%). In 2014, the 3 year performance in Literacy of the TAG group was 75.59% (did not meet the 3 year performance AMO of 78.82) and All Students Growth in Literacy was 82.85 (failing to meet the AMO of 84.35)

Goal	All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and literary.
Benchmark	PERFORMANCE: At the end of the end of the 2013-2014 school year,

79.31% (5.04% below AMO) of ALL STUDENTS proficient/advanced on the Benchmark assessment; and 72.50% (6.32% below AMO) of the TAG group scored proficient/advanced on the Benchmark assessment. GROWTH: At the end of the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 82.35% of ALL STUDENTS met growth on the Benchmark assessment; and 75.68% of the TAG group met growth on the Benchmark assessment. At the end of the 2014-15 school year 86.09% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must be proficient/advanced, and 81.17% or greater of the TAG group must be proficient/advanced; and 86.71% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must meet their projected growth, and 82.51% or greater of the TAG group must meet their projected growth in order to meet the school' s AMO. Our goal is to meet and/or exceed the projected AMO for PERFORMANCE and GROWTH in all grade levels for ALL STUDENTS, including those in the TAG group.

Intervention: Implement the state initiated balanced literacy program to improve student achievement.				
Scientific Based Research: A Framework for Understanding Poverty, 5th Edition; Ruby Payne. Multi-tier System of Supports; Read 180 (professional paper). ADE Website: TESS Teacher Support Training; http://www.arkansased.org/divisions/human-resources-educator-effectiveness-and-licensure/office-of-educator-effectiveness/teacher-evaluation-system/tess-teacher-support-training . Formative Assessment and Standards-Based Grading; Marzano. Enhancing Professional Practice, 2nd Edition; Charlotte Danielson. Classroom Instruction that Works, 2nd Edition; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler, Stone. Strategies that Work; Harvey, Goudvis. Greek and Latin Roots: keys to Building vocabulary; Rasiski, Padak, Newton, Newton.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA Funds will be used to fund a .80 FTE paraprofessional to provide tutoring under the guidance of classroom teachers in the areas of math and literacy; including reading in the content areas. Cheryl Hilser Action Type: Equity	Michael Spraggins, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	Title Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$3,884.17 ACTION BUDGET: \$3,884.17
Total Budget:				\$3,884.17

Priority 2: Mathematics

Supporting Data: 1. Fifth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 84% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 84%

of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 74% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 76% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 76% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 70% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 72% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Measurement, and Open Response Data Analysis and Probability. 69% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

2. Sixth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 77% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Measurement and Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations. 76% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Measurement and Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations. 72% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Measurement and Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations. On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 90% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Measurement and Data Analysis. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Measurement and Data Analysis. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were

Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Measurement and Data Analysis. On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 82% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple choice Geometry, Multiple Choice Data Analysis, and Open Response Data Analysis. 80% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 76% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

3. Seventh Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 89% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Data Analysis and Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Data Analysis and Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations. 89% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Data Analysis and Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations. On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 72% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geography; Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations; and Open Response Measurement. 74% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geography; Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations; and Open Response Measurement. 70% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geography; Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations; and Open Response Measurement. On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 77% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple choice Algebra and Geometry, Open Response Numbers/Operations, Open Response Measurement, and Open Response Data Analysis and Probability. 76% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 73% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.
4. Eighth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 85% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 84% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 83% of the Economically Disadvantaged

students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 86% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 85% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 82% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 72% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Algebra. 72% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 67% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

5. EOC-Algebra Exam 2012-# 100.0% of Combined Students scored proficient or advanced. 2013-# 100.0% of Combined Students scored proficient or advanced. 2014-# 100.0% of Combined Students scored proficient or advanced.
6. Normed Referenced Testing Fifth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 46% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 50% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 47% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the ITBS. 64% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 65% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Sixth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 49% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 59% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 52% of the combined population scored at or

above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Priority 1: Increase MATHEMATICS Skills and Performance Seventh Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 59% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 63% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Eighth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS.

7. 2012 BMS AMO Report In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2012 in Math was 83.54 (surpassing the AMO of 80.93) and the TAG group performance was 77.23 (surpassing the AMO of 74.74). In Math: All Students Growth for 2012 in Math was 80.56 (surpassing the AMO of 78.07) and the TAG group growth was 74.16 (surpassing the AMO of 71.87). The 3 year Growth in Math of the TAG group was 70.61 (did not meet the 3 year performance AMO of 71.87). The 3 year Growth in Math of the All Students was 77.53 (did not meet the 3 year Growth AMO of 78.07). 2013 BMS AMO Report In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2013 in Math was 80.19 (the AMO of 82.67) and the TAG group performance was (the AMO of 77.03). In Math: All Students Growth for 2013 in Math was 71.17 (the AMO of 80.07) and the TAG group growth was 69.06 (the AMO of 74.43). 2014 BMS AMO Report In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2014 in Math was 76.53 (7.87% short of

the AMO of 84.40) and the TAG group performance was 70.24 (9.09% short of the AMO of 79.33). In Math: All Students Growth for 2014 in Math was 62.86 (19.2% short of the AMO of 82.06%) and the TAG group growth was 55.26% (21.72% short of the AMO of 74.43%).

Goal	All students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions.
Benchmark	Performance: At the end of the end of the 2013-14 school year, ALL STUDENTS Scores in Math were 76.53% (7.87% short of the AMO of 84.40) and the TAG group performance was 70.24 (9.09% short of the AMO of 79.33). Growth: All Students Growth for 2013-2014 in Math was 62.86 (19.2% short of the AMO of 82.06%) and the TAG group growth was 55.26% (21.72% short of the AMO of 74.43%). At the end of the 2014-15 school year 86.13% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must be proficient/advanced, and 81.63% or greater of the TAG group must be proficient/advanced; and 84.05% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must meet their projected growth, and 79.54% or greater of the TAG group must meet their projected growth in order to meet the school' s AMO. Our goal is to meet and/or exceed the projected AMO for PERFORMANCE and GROWTH in all grade levels for ALL STUDENTS, including those in the TAG group.

Intervention: Implement a standards based mathematics program.

Scientific Based Research: Research: "What is Standing in the Way of Middle School Mathematics Curriculum Reform?" by Robert Reyes, et. al. "Problem Solving" by John Woodward "Linking Problem Solving to Student Achievement in Mathematics" by Jennifer Bay "Is Problem Solving in Middle School Mathematics Normal?" by A. Susan Gaither "A Framework for Understanding Poverty" buy Ruby K. Payne, Ph.D.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to fund a sixth grade teacher, Brittany Denton, for the purpose of class size reduction. This reduction in student-to-teacher ratio will enhance the quality of all subject areas in sixth grade where the district is already meeting state standards. No federal supplanting of state effort will be	Lana Hughes, Fed. Coor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$8,178.07 ACTION BUDGET: \$8,178.07

implemented. This class totals 66 students with ratio before CSR be 22 which meets state requirements. After CSR is now 16.5. 1.0 FTE Brittany Denton Action Type: Equity Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$8,178.07

Priority 3: Wellness

Supporting Data:

1. Body Mass Index Data for the 2010-2011 school year: of the student population, 80 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or obese: Males - 39.7% and Females - 39% Body Mass Index Data for the 2009-2010 school year: of the student population, 80 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or obese: Males - 37.4% and Females - 33.8% Body Mass Index Data for the 2008-2009 school year: of the student population, 128 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students who were overweight or at risk of being overweight: Males - 47.8% and Females - 45.7% Body Mass Index Data for the 2007-2008 school year: of the 367 student population, 292 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and overweight: Males - 43.7% and Females - 42.6%
2. School Health Index Module 1, School Health and Safety Policies and Environment - Communicating school health and safety policies to students, parents, staff, and visitors, and Staff development on unintentional injuries, violence, and suicide were partially in place. School Health Index Module 3, Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - Two hundred twenty five minutes of physical education per week (or an average thereof) were in place. Also, adequate teacher/student ratio, teachers avoiding practices that result in student inactivity, promotion of communication physical activities, and participation in extracurricular physical activity programs were in place.
3. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2011-2012 school year: (Data not available at time of plan submission) Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2010-2011 school year: 42% paid, 58% reduced/free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2009-2010 school year: 39% paid, 14% reduced, 47% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2008-2009 school year: 41% paid, 12%

reduced, 47% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2007-2008 school year: 42% paid, 12% reduced, 44% free.

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

Benchmark By the 2014-2015 school year, there will be a decrease in the average body mass index for students by 1/2% as evaluated by the annual Body Mass Index Screening.

Intervention: Bismarck Middle School will continue to implement practices to provide opportunities for students to practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage them to make healthy food and physical activity choices resulting in increased academic performance.				
Scientific Based Research: Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Healthy Eating (June 14, 1996/Vol. 45/No. RR-9); Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity (March 7, 1997/Vol. 46/No. RR-6)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NLSA funds will be used to pay .50 FTE Certified Guidance Counselor to coordinate and direct activities with the purpose of helping all students develop skills in the areas of personal/social growth, educational planning, and career and vocational development. This position is over and above the state standards. Denise Rogers, Counselor Action Type: Equity	Lana Hughes, Federal Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Community Leaders - Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$6,365.22 ACTION BUDGET: \$6,365.22
Total Budget:				\$6,365.22

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$74306.99

Priority 1: Literacy

Supporting Data:

1. 5th Grade On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 86% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Content, and Open Response Literary. 86% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Content, and Open REsponse Literary. 76% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open REsponse Content, and Open REsponse Literary. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 89% of the combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open REsponse Content and Open REsponse Practical. 86% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Content and Open Response Practical. 89% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open REsponse Content and Open Response Practical. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy Exam: 83% of our combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Writing Content and Open Response Writing Style. 80% of caucasian students scored proficient or advanced while other ethnicities scored 100% proficient or advanced. 82% of the economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or advanced.
2. Sixth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 80% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Content, and Open Response Practical. 81% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Content, and Open Response Practical. 76% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Content, and Open Response Practical. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 77% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Content and Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing in Content and Style. 78% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Content and Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing in Content and Style. 60% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Content and Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing in Content and Style. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy exam: 78% of the combined population

scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Writing Content and Style. 75% of the caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. 74% of the economically disadvantaged students were proficient or advanced.

3. Seventh Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 89% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Content. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Content. 85% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Content. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 89% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Writing Open Response Content and Style. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Writing Open Response Content and Style. 86% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Writing Open Response Content and Style. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy exam: 83% of the combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were open response writing content and style domains. 83% of the caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or advanced.
4. Eighth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Literacy exam: 85% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population was Open Response Literary. 84% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population was Open Response Literary. 80% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population was Open Response Literary. On the 2013 Benchmark Literacy exam: 90% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing, Content, and Style. 90% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing, Content, and Style. 84% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were

Open Response Practical Reading; and Open Response Writing, Content, and Style. On the 2014 Benchmark Literacy Exam: 80% of the combined population scored proficient or advanced. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open-Response Reading Content Passage, Writing Content, and Writing Style. 80% of caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 74% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

5. Fifth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 46% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 50% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 47% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the ITBS. 64% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 65% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Sixth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 49% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 59% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 52% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Priority 1: Increase MATHEMATICS Skills and Performance Seventh Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 59% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 63% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Eighth Grade ITBS

Literacy and Math: In 2011, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS.

6. 2012 BMS AMO Report In 2012, 5-8 was Achieving in both Literacy and Math. In Literacy: All Students Proficiency performance for 2012 in Literacy was 84.92 (surpassing the AMO of 80.87) and the TAG group performance was 77.6 (surpassing the AMO of 74.11). The 3 year performance in Literacy of the TAG group was 73.23 (did not meet the 3 year performance AMO of 74.11). In Literacy: All Students Growth for 2012 in Literacy was 88.89 (surpassing the AMO of 81.73) and the TAG group growth was 82.58 (surpassing the AMO of 75.95). In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2012 in Math was 83.54 (surpassing the AMO of 80.93) and the TAG group performance was 77.23 (surpassing the AMO of 74.74). In Math: All Students Growth for 2012 in Math was 80.56 (surpassing the AMO of 78.07) and the TAG group growth was 74.16 (surpassing the AMO of 71.87). 2013 BMS AMO Report In 2013, 5-8 was classified as Achieving in Literacy and classified as Needs Improvement in Math. In Literacy: All Students Proficiency performance for 2013 in Literacy was 83.83 (the AMO of 82.61) and the TAG group performance was 76.26 (the AMO of 76.47). In Literacy: All Students Growth for 2013 in Literacy was 85.77 (the AMO of 83.39) and the TAG group growth was 79.56 (the AMO of 78.13). In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2013 in Math was 80.19 (the AMO of 82.67) and the TAG group performance was (the AMO of 77.03). In 2014, 5-8 was rated Needs Improvement Literacy. All Students Proficiency performance for 2014 in Literacy was 79.31% (failing to meet the 84.35% AMO) and the TAG group performance was 72.50 % (failing to meet the AMO of 78.82%). In 2014, the 3 year performance in Literacy of the TAG group was 75.59% (did not meet the 3 year performance AMO of 78.82) and All Students Growth in Literacy was 82.85 (failing to meet the AMO of 84.35)

Goal

All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and sentence formation and reading content and

literary.

Benchmark PERFORMANCE: At the end of the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 79.31% (5.04% below AMO) of ALL STUDENTS proficient/advanced on the Benchmark assessment; and 72.50% (6.32% below AMO) of the TAG group scored proficient/advanced on the Benchmark assessment. GROWTH: At the end of the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 82.35% of ALL STUDENTS met growth on the Benchmark assessment; and 75.68% of the TAG group met growth on the Benchmark assessment. At the end of the 2014-15 school year 86.09% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must be proficient/advanced, and 81.17% or greater of the TAG group must be proficient/advanced; and 86.71% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must meet their projected growth, and 82.51% or greater of the TAG group must meet their projected growth in order to meet the school' s AMO. Our goal is to meet and/or exceed the projected AMO for PERFORMANCE and GROWTH in all grade levels for ALL STUDENTS, including those in the TAG group.

Intervention: Implement the state initiated balanced literacy program to improve student achievement.

Scientific Based Research: A Framework for Understanding Poverty, 5th Edition; Ruby Payne. Multi-tier System of Supports; Read 180 (professional paper). ADE Website: TESS Teacher Support Training; <http://www.arkansased.org/divisions/human-resources-educator-effectiveness-and-licensure/office-of-educator-effectiveness/teacher-evaluation-system/tess-teacher-support-training> . Formative Assessment and Standards-Based Grading; Marzano. Enhancing Professional Practice, 2nd Edition; Charlotte Danielson. Classroom Instruction that Works, 2nd Edition; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler, Stone. Strategies that Work; Harvey, Goudvis. Greek and Latin Roots: keys to Building vocabulary; Rasiski, Padak, Newton, Newton.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA Funds will be used to fund a .80 FTE paraprofessional to provide tutoring under the guidance of classroom teachers in the areas of math and literacy; including reading in the content areas. Cheryl Hilser Action Type: Equity	Michael Spraggins, Principal	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	Title Teachers	NSLA (State-281) \$11,289.47 - Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$11,289.47
Total Budget:				\$11,289.47

Priority 2: Mathematics

Supporting Data: 1. Fifth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 84% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest

identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 84% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 74% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 76% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 76% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations 70% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 72% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Geometry; Open Response Measurement, and Open Response Data Analysis and Probability. 69% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

2. Sixth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 77% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Measurement and Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations. 76% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Measurement and Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations. 72% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Measurement and Open Response Numbers, Properties, and Operations. On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 90% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Measurement and Data Analysis. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Measurement and Data Analysis. 85% of the economically

disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Measurement and Data Analysis. On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 82% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple choice Geometry, Multiple Choice Data Analysis, and Open Response Data Analysis. 80% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 76% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

3. Seventh Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 89% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Data Analysis and Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations. 89% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Open Response Data Analysis and Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations. 89% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Data Analysis and Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations. On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 72% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geography; Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations; and Open Response Measurement. 74% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geography; Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations; and Open Response Measurement. 70% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geography; Open Response Numbers, Properties, Operations; and Open Response Measurement. On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 77% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple choice Algebra and Geometry, Open Response Numbers/Operations, Open Response Measurement, and Open Response Data Analysis and Probability. 76% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 73% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.
4. Eighth Grade: On the 2012 Benchmark Math exam: 85% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 84% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for

the Caucasian population were Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 83% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. On the 2013 Benchmark Math exam: 86% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 85% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Caucasian population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. 82% of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the Economically Disadvantaged population were Multiple Choice Algebra; Multiple Choice Geometry; Open Response Algebra and Open Response Measurement. On the 2014 Benchmark Math exam: 72% of the Combined population scored at or above proficient. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were Open Response Algebra. 72% of the Caucasian students scored at or above proficient. 67% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above proficient.

5. EOC-Algebra Exam 2012-# 100.0% of Combined Students scored proficient or advanced. 2013-# 100.0% of Combined Students scored proficient or advanced. 2014-# 100.0% of Combined Students scored proficient or advanced.
6. Normed Referenced Testing Fifth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 46% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 50% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 47% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the reading comprehension portion of the ITBS. 64% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 65% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Sixth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 49% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 59% of the combined

population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 52% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 61% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Priority 1: Increase MATHEMATICS Skills and Performance Seventh Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 56% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 59% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 63% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 51% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 53% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. Eighth Grade ITBS Literacy and Math: In 2011, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 60% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2012, 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS. In 2013, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the Reading Comprehension portion of the ITBS. On the Language portion, 57% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile. 62% of the combined population scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MATH portion of the ITBS.

7. 2012 BMS AMO Report In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2012 in Math was 83.54 (surpassing the AMO of 80.93) and the TAG group performance was 77.23 (surpassing the AMO of 74.74). In Math: All Students Growth for 2012 in Math was 80.56 (surpassing the AMO of 78.07) and the TAG group growth was 74.16 (surpassing the AMO of 71.87). The 3 year Growth in Math of the TAG group was 70.61 (did not meet the 3 year performance AMO of 71.87). The 3 year Growth in Math of the All Students was 77.53 (did not meet the 3 year Growth AMO of 78.07). 2013 BMS AMO Report In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2013 in Math was 80.19 (the AMO of 82.67) and the TAG group performance was (the AMO of 77.03). In Math: All Students Growth for 2013 in Math was 71.17 (the AMO of 80.07) and the TAG group growth was

69.06 (the AMO of 74.43). 2014 BMS AMO Report In Math: All Students Proficiency performance for 2014 in Math was 76.53 (7.87% short of the AMO of 84.40) and the TAG group performance was 70.24 (9.09% short of the AMO of 79.33). In Math: All Students Growth for 2014 in Math was 62.86 (19.2% short of the AMO of 82.06%) and the TAG group growth was 55.26% (21.72% short of the AMO of 74.43%).

Goal	All students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions.
Benchmark	Performance: At the end of the end of the 2013-14 school year, ALL STUDENTS Scores in Math were 76.53% (7.87% short of the AMO of 84.40) and the TAG group performance was 70.24 (9.09% short of the AMO of 79.33). Growth: All Students Growth for 2013-2014 in Math was 62.86 (19.2% short of the AMO of 82.06%) and the TAG group growth was 55.26% (21.72% short of the AMO of 74.43%). At the end of the 2014-15 school year 86.13% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must be proficient/advanced, and 81.63% or greater of the TAG group must be proficient/advanced; and 84.05% or greater of ALL STUDENTS must meet their projected growth, and 79.54% or greater of the TAG group must meet their projected growth in order to meet the school' s AMO. Our goal is to meet and/or exceed the projected AMO for PERFORMANCE and GROWTH in all grade levels for ALL STUDENTS, including those in the TAG group.

Intervention: Implement a standards based mathematics program.				
Scientific Based Research: Research: "What is Standing in the Way of Middle School Mathematics Curriculum Reform?" by Robert Reyes, et. al. "Problem Solving" by John Woodward "Linking Problem Solving to Student Achievement in Mathematics" by Jennifer Bay "Is Problem Solving in Middle School Mathematics Normal?" by A. Susan Gaither "A Framework for Understanding Poverty" buy Ruby K. Payne, Ph.D.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to fund a sixth grade teacher, Brittany Denton, for the purpose of class size reduction. This reduction in student-to-teacher ratio will enhance the quality of all subject areas in sixth grade where the district is	Lana Hughes, Fed. Coor	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	Teachers	NSLA (State-281) \$37,774.00 - Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$37,774.00

already meeting state standards. No federal supplanting of state effort will be implemented. This class totals 66 students with ratio before CSR be 22 which meets state requirements. After CSR is now 16.5. 1.0 FTE Brittany Denton Action Type: Equity Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$37,774.00

Priority 3: Wellness

Supporting Data:

1. Body Mass Index Data for the 2010-2011 school year: of the student population, 80 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or obese: Males - 39.7% and Females - 39% Body Mass Index Data for the 2009-2010 school year: of the student population, 80 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of being overweight or obese: Males - 37.4% and Females - 33.8% Body Mass Index Data for the 2008-2009 school year: of the student population, 128 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students who were overweight or at risk of being overweight: Males - 47.8% and Females - 45.7% Body Mass Index Data for the 2007-2008 school year: of the 367 student population, 292 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, the following represents the percent of students at risk of overweight and overweight: Males - 43.7% and Females - 42.6%
2. School Health Index Module 1, School Health and Safety Policies and Environment - Communicating school health and safety policies to students, parents, staff, and visitors, and Staff development on unintentional injuries, violence, and suicide were partially in place. School Health Index Module 3, Physical Education and Other Physical Activity Programs - Two hundred twenty five minutes of physical education per week (or an average thereof) were in place. Also, adequate teacher/student ratio, teachers avoiding practices that result in student inactivity, promotion of communication physical activities, and participation in extracurricular physical activity programs were in place.
3. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2011-2012 school year:

(Data not available at time of plan submission) Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2010-2011 school year: 42% paid, 58% reduced/free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2009-2010 school year: 39% paid, 14% reduced, 47% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2008-2009 school year: 41% paid, 12% reduced, 47% free. Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility for the 2007-2008 school year: 42% paid, 12% reduced, 44% free.

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

Benchmark By the 2014-2015 school year, there will be a decrease in the average body mass index for students by 1/2% as evaluated by the annual Body Mass Index Screening.

Intervention: Bismarck Middle School will continue to implement practices to provide opportunities for students to practice healthy behaviors at school and encourage them to make healthy food and physical activity choices resulting in increased academic performance.				
Scientific Based Research: Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Healthy Eating (June 14, 1996/Vol. 45/No. RR-9); Guidelines for School Health Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity (March 7, 1997/Vol. 46/No. RR-6)				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NLSA funds will be used to pay .50 FTE Certified Guidance Counselor to coordinate and direct activities with the purpose of helping all students develop skills in the areas of personal/social growth, educational planning, and career and vocational development. This position is over and above the state standards. Denise Rogers, Counselor	Lana Hughes, Federal Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Community Leaders - Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - \$25,243.52 Employee Salaries: ACTION BUDGET: \$25,243.52

Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$25,243.52

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) - Purchased Services -- \$0

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

BISMARCK SCHOOL DISTRICT -- \$83972.36

Source of Funds

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

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- \$14555.37

Priority 1: Administrative Support

Supporting Data:

1. Elementary is classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. Elementary is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% with 82.29% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 85.58% with 80.56% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response and problem solving. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and style and open response reading content.
2. Middle School was classified in 2011-12 as an Achieving School in math and literacy for all students and TAGG. In 2012-13, Middle School was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. In 2013-14 Middle School is classified as a Needs Improvement School in both math and literacy for all students and TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.25% with 74.22% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.85% with 75.59% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and style.

3. High School was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. High School is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. Three year average for all students in math is 84.21% with 81.90% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 85.90% with 80.74% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, high school students will demonstrate improvement in mathematical skills. Specifically they will improve in Triangles Open Response, measurements Open Response, Relationships between two and three dimension, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformation on the PARCC Geometry exam. On the PARCC Algebra I they will improve in Open Response Solve Equations & Inequalities. Students with disabilities, Hispanic, and LEP students will be the focus during the Academic Resource Period to raise the scores of those sub populations. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, high school students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy Exam.
4. District rates: Attendance rate 2011-12 94.97, 2012-13 95.45, 2013-14 94.97. Graduation rate 2011-12 87.67, 2011-12 TAGG 82.14, 2012-13 90.67, 2012-13 TAGG 89.74%, 2013-14 87.95%. Drop out rate 2011-12 1.3%, 2012-13 1.8%, 2013-14 1.39%.

Goal	Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for schools to meet State Goals and Objectives as identified in the ESEA Accountability Report.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for federal and state programs in individual schools to improve student achievement in math, literacy, and science.

Intervention: Provide leadership, service, and support to individual schools.

Scientific Based Research: "Begin With the Brain in Mind" by Martha Kaufeldt, copyright 2010 by Corwin. "Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for TEaching" by Charlotte Danielson, copyright 2012 by ASCD. "Leaning by Doing", A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work" by Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker, and Thomas Many, copyright 2010. "Instructional Strategies, How to Teach Rigor and Relevance", by International Center for Leadership in Education, Inc. copyright 2009. Leading Good Schools to Greatness by Susan Gray and William Streshly, copyright 2010 .

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

NSLA funds will be used to pay 1.0 FTE Curriculum Coordinator, Ellen Coleman. These funds will be used to pay salary and benefits. Job responsibilities will include assisting with curriculum alignment with state curriculum documents; alignment of classroom assessment with statewide exams; instructional strategies; professional development and implementation of training; choosing standards-based instructional materials; understanding of current research; advantageous arrangement of the instructional day; and integrating	Susan Stewart, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: \$14,555.37 ACTION BUDGET: \$14,555.37
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	--

technology into instruction. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$14,555.37

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- \$67230.35

Priority 1: Administrative Support

1. Elementary is classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. Elementary is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% with 82.29% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 85.58% with 80.56% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response and problem solving. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and style and open response reading content.
2. Middle School was classified in 2011-12 as an Achieving School in math and literacy for all students and TAGG. In 2012-13, Middle School was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. In 2013-14 Middle School is classified as a Needs Improvement School in both math and literacy for all students and TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.25% with 74.22% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.85% with 75.59% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and style.
3. High School was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. High School is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. Three year average for all students in math is 84.21% with 81.90% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 85.90% with 80.74% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, high school students will demonstrate

Supporting Data:

improvement in mathematical skills. Specifically they will improve in Triangles Open Response, measurements Open Response, Relationships between two and three dimension, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformation on the PARCC Geometry exam. On the PARCC Algebra I they will improve in Open Response Solve Equations & Inequalities. Students with disabilities, Hispanic, and LEP students will be the focus during the Academic Resource Period to raise the scores of those sub populations. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, high school students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy Exam.

4. District rates: Attendance rate 2011-12 94.97, 2012-13 95.45, 2013-14 94.97. Graduation rate 2011-12 87.67, 2011-12 TAGG 82.14, 2012-13 90.67, 2012-13 TAGG 89.74%, 2013-14 87.95%. Drop out rate 2011-12 1.3%, 2012-13 1.8%, 2013-14 1.39%.

Goal	Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for schools to meet State Goals and Objectives as identified in the ESEA Accountability Report.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for federal and state programs in individual schools to improve student achievement in math, literacy, and science.

Intervention: Provide leadership, service, and support to individual schools.				
Scientific Based Research: "Begin With the Brain in Mind" by Martha Kaufeldt, copyright 2010 by Corwin. "Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for TEaching" by Charlotte Danielson, copyright 2012 by ASCD. "Leaning by Doing", A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work" by Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker, and Thomas Many, copyright 2010. "Instructional Strategies, How to Teach Rigor and Relevance", by International Center for Leadership in Education, Inc. copyright 2009. Leading Good Schools to Greatness by Susan Gray and William Streshly, copyright 2010 .				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to pay 1.0 FTE Curriculum Coordinator, Ellen Coleman.	Susan Stewart, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Administrative Staff - Central Office - District Staff	NSLA (State-281) - \$67,230.35 Employee Salaries:

These funds will be used to pay salary and benefits. Job responsibilities will include assisting with curriculum alignment with state curriculum documents; alignment of classroom assessment with statewide exams; instructional strategies; professional development and implementation of training; choosing standards-based instructional materials; understanding of current research; advantageous arrangement of the instructional day; and integrating technology into instruction. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration				ACTION BUDGET: \$67,230.35
---	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

students will be the focus during the Academic Resource Period to raise the scores of those sub populations. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, high school students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy Exam.

4. District rates: Attendance rate 2011-12 94.97, 2012-13 95.45, 2013-14 94.97. Graduation rate 2011-12 87.67, 2011-12 TAGG 82.14, 2012-13 90.67, 2012-13 TAGG 89.74%, 2013-14 87.95%. Drop out rate 2011-12 1.3%, 2012-13 1.8%, 2013-14 1.39%.

Goal	Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for schools to meet State Goals and Objectives as identified in the ESEA Accountability Report.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for federal and state programs in individual schools to improve student achievement in math, literacy, and science.

Intervention: Provide leadership, service, and support to individual schools.

Scientific Based Research: "Begin With the Brain in Mind" by Martha Kaufeldt, copyright 2010 by Corwin. "Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for TEaching" by Charlotte Danielson, copyright 2012 by ASCD. "Learning by Doing", A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work" by Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker, and Thomas Many, copyright 2010. "Instructional Strategies, How to Teach Rigor and Relevance", by International Center for Leadership in Education, Inc. copyright 2009. Leading Good Schools to Greatness by Susan Gray and William Streshly, copyright 2010 .

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to pay 1.0 FTE Curriculum Coordinator, Ellen Coleman. These funds will be used to pay salary and benefits. Job responsibilities will include	Susan Stewart, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Administrative Staff - Central Office - District Staff	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: \$2,129.17 ACTION BUDGET: \$2,129.17

assisting with curriculum alignment with state curriculum documents; alignment of classroom assessment with statewide exams; instructional strategies; professional development and implementation of training; choosing standards-based instructional materials; understanding of current research; advantageous arrangement of the instructional day; and integrating technology into instruction. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$2,129.17

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- \$57.47

Priority 1: Administrative Support

Supporting Data: 1. Elementary is classified as a Needs Improvement school in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. Elementary is

an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. Three year average for all students in math is 87.47% with 82.29% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 85.58% with 80.56% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response and problem solving. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and style and open response reading content.

2. Middle School was classified in 2011-12 as an Achieving School in math and literacy for all students and TAGG. In 2012-13, Middle School was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG and an Achieving school in literacy for all students, but Needs Improvement for TAGG. In 2013-14 Middle School is classified as a Needs Improvement School in both math and literacy for all students and TAGG. Three year average for all students in math is 80.25% with 74.22% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 82.85% with 75.59% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, all students will improve in mathematics, specifically in the areas of open response data analysis, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, and patterns, algebra and functions. All students will improve in the area of literacy, specifically, the areas of open response writing content and style.
3. High School was classified as a Needs Improvement School in math for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. High School is an Achieving school in literacy for all students and TAGG for 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. Three year average for all students in math is 84.21% with 81.90% for TAGG. Three year average for all students in literacy is 85.90% with 80.74% for TAGG. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, high school students will demonstrate improvement in mathematical skills. Specifically they will improve in Triangles Open Response, measurements Open Response, Relationships between two and three dimension, and Coordinate Geometry and Transformation on the PARCC Geometry exam. On the PARCC Algebra I they will improve in Open Response Solve Equations & Inequalities. Students with disabilities, Hispanic, and LEP students will be the focus during the Academic Resource Period to raise the scores of those sub populations. After analyzing test results from 2013-14, high school students will demonstrate improvement in the content and style areas of written communication skills. They will improve comprehension skills Literary/Prose and Content passages of the PARCC Literacy Exam.
4. District rates: Attendance rate 2011-12 94.97, 2012-13 95.45, 2013-14 94.97. Graduation rate 2011-12 87.67, 2011-12 TAGG 82.14, 2012-13 90.67, 2012-13 TAGG 89.74%, 2013-14 87.95%. Drop out rate 2011-

12 1.3%, 2012-13 1.8%, 2013-14 1.39%.

Goal	Provide administrative support to individual schools supporting federal and state programs in effort to improve Literacy and math achievement for all students. The areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and problem solving are key target areas of improvement.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for schools to meet State Goals and Objectives as identified in the ESEA Accountability Report.
Benchmark	Bismarck School District will provide support for federal and state programs in individual schools to improve student achievement in math, literacy, and science.

Intervention: Provide leadership, service, and support to individual schools.

Scientific Based Research: "Begin With the Brain in Mind" by Martha Kaufeldt, copyright 2010 by Corwin. "Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for TEaching" by Charlotte Danielson, copyright 2012 by ASCD. "Learning by Doing", A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work" by Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker, and Thomas Many, copyright 2010. "Instructional Strategies, How to Teach Rigor and Relevance", by International Center for Leadership in Education, Inc. copyright 2009. Leading Good Schools to Greatness by Susan Gray and William Streshly, copyright 2010 .

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
NSLA funds will be used to pay 1.0 FTE Curriculum Coordinator, Ellen Coleman. These funds will be used to pay salary and benefits. Job responsibilities will include assisting with curriculum alignment with state curriculum documents; alignment of classroom assessment with statewide exams; instructional strategies;	Susan Stewart, Superintendent	Start: 07/01/2014 End: 06/30/2015	- Administrative Staff - Central Office - District Staff	NSLA (State-281) - \$57.47 Purchased Services: ACTION BUDGET: \$57.47

professional development and implementation of training; choosing standards-based instructional materials; understanding of current research; advantageous arrangement of the instructional day; and integrating technology into instruction. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity				
Total Budget:				\$57.47