



## Research Report

# State Programs Designed to Improve Schools' Student Achievement

December 14, 2009

Prepared for  
Rep. Bill Abernathy  
Interim Study Proposal 2009-198

BUREAU OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH

# Table of Contents

About This Report ..... 1

School Improvement ..... 2

America's Choice ..... 4

Scholastic Audit..... 8

Arkansas Leadership Academy's School Support Program ..... 16

Summary Conclusion ..... 19

## About This Report

The Bureau of Legislative Research (BLR) was asked to examine the system of state programs designed to identify and help struggling schools in Arkansas. The BLR was also asked to review the programs' impact, where possible. This report focuses on three programs that have been operating long enough to show results: America's Choice, scholastic audit and the Arkansas Leadership Academy's School Support Program.

First, the BLR asked the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) about the agency's own efforts to evaluate and distinguish between effective and ineffective programs and interventions, in terms of student achievement and other desired outcomes. Dr. Gayle Potter provided the response below.

I do not have the personnel, resources, nor even the job assignment to do program evaluation within my section alone. However, Dr. [Diana] Julian has created a cross-agency program evaluation team that I am serving on. It has been three years since turn-around programs like America's Choice and others have been in place, and ADE now has sufficient data to plan and implement a research design to study the issues raised in this question. Dr. Charity Smith is chairing the Program Evaluation Work Group, and Dr. Julian has oversight of all the group's efforts. Future information on the work of this group may be obtained from Dr. Julian or Dr. Smith.

For its analysis, the BLR compared schools' year-over-year school improvement statuses to determine the impact that the supportive services may have had on each school that received them. The BLR chose to examine school improvement status because it provides a single calculation to describe a variety of student test scores. However, the programs' full impact on student achievement may not be revealed through changes in school improvement status alone. For example, a school's test scores may have improved but not enough to move them out of school improvement. The information in this report should be considered just one measure of the programs' effectiveness.

## School Improvement

The following table lists each school improvement status, shows how it is abbreviated in this report and gives a definition of each. It takes two consecutive years of not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) to get on the school improvement list and two consecutive years of making AYP to get off. The table describes the school improvement statuses only through year three, but there are schools in year 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of school improvement.

Status	Abbreviation	Description
Met Standards	MS	The school made AYP and is not on the school improvement list.
Alert	A	The school did not make AYP this year. If the school fails to make AYP next year, it will go on the school improvement list.
School Improvement: Year 1	SI_1	The school failed to make AYP for two consecutive years and is now in its first year of school improvement.
School Improvement: Year 1, Met Standards	SI_1(M)	Last year the school was in the first year of school improvement, but this year the school met standards. If the school meets standards again next year, it will be removed from the school improvement list.
School Improvement: Year 2	SI_2	The school is in its second year of school improvement.
School Improvement: Year 2, Met Standards	SI_2(M)	Last year the school was in the second year of school improvement, but this year the school met standards. If the school meets standards again next year, it will be removed from the school improvement list.
School Improvement: Year 3	SI_3	The school is in its third year of school improvement.
School Improvement: Year 3, Met Standards	SI_3(M)	Last year the school was in the second year of school improvement, but this year the school met standards. If the school meets standards again next year, it will be removed from the school improvement list.

There are currently 404 schools on the school improvement list and another 173 on alert. Of the state's nearly 1,100 schools, 503 — fewer than half — are meeting standards.

In 2008-09, ADE began using a different categorization system, known as Smart Accountability or Differentiated Accountability. That system categorizes schools under new labels that provide more useful descriptions of schools' deficits and needs. Because 2008-09 is the only year schools have been categorized under the new system, this report does not use the Smart Accountability labels.

Color-coded tables throughout this report show whether the schools that participated in America's Choice, a scholastic audit or the School Support Program improved their school improvement status, stayed the same or worsened (stayed in school improvement for another

year). The tables examine the status change from one year to the next and color-code the progress accordingly. Green indicates an improvement was made, red indicates the school's status worsened and yellow indicates the school status either did not change or made a lateral change. For example, a school that was in School Improvement: Year 1 (SI\_1) in 2006-07 and went to School Improvement: Year 2 (SI\_2) in 2007-08 is color-coded red because its status worsened. A school that was in School Improvement: Year 2 (SI\_2), but is now in Year 2, meeting standards, [SI\_2(M)] would be color-coded green. A school that was not in school improvement (MS) two years in a row is also coded green.

In some cases, a school's status change was neither an improvement nor or a decline. For example, a school that was in School Improvement: Year 4, but met standards [SI\_4(M)] because of one subpopulation, but is now on Alert (A) for a different subpopulation. Those schools are also color-coded yellow.

Again, it is important to note that while a school's status may have worsened, its student test scores may have actually improved. Changes designated in red do not necessarily indicate a decline in student performance.

### Comparison group

The following table provides a sample of randomly selected schools in school improvement that did not receive a scholastic audit and did not receive services through America's Choice or the Arkansas Leadership Academy's School Support Program. This group of schools and their school improvement statuses are provided as a comparison to those schools that received support services. However, it is important to note that, because the support programs examined in this report specifically targeted the schools that needed help most, the schools in the sample below are, for the most part, in less advanced stages of school improvement.

School	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
GOZA MIDDLE	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_3	SI_4
J.F.WAHL ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	A	A
STEPHENS ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	A	SI_1
PLAINVIEW-ROVER HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_2	SI_3
CROSSETT HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5
FULLER MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
ALBERT PIKE ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4
MONTICELLO MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_2(M)	MS	A	MS
LONOKE HIGH	SI_1(M)	A	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3
AMBOY ELEMENTARY	SI_1	SI_2	SI_2	SI_2(M)	MS
PEAKE ELEMENTARY	SI_1	SI_1(M)	SI_2	SI_2(M)	MS
BIGELOW HIGH	SI_1	SI_1(M)	MS	A	MS
GANDY ELEMENTARY	SI_1	SI_1(M)	MS	MS	MS
NEWPORT JR. HIGH	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5
BEECH CREST ELEMENTARY	A	SI_1	SI_1(M)	A	SI_1

## America's Choice

America's Choice is a Washington D.C.-based company offering turnaround services for schools not meeting AYP. ADE contracts with the company to provide professional development training and on-site technical assistance, including facilitating teacher and leadership meetings for the school, demonstrating teaching strategies in the classroom and coaching the school's academic coaches.

### School Selection

For the 2006-07 school year, 30 schools were chosen to receive services from America's Choice. The next year, 21 of those schools again received services from America's Choice, and nine new schools were selected for a total of 30 schools. In 2008-09, 37 schools were chosen. Of the 37 schools, 20 participated in America's Choice during both of the previous two years, 10 participated in one of the previous two years, and seven new schools were selected. From 2006-07 to 2008-09, a total of 45 schools received services from America's Choice.

The following table shows the number of America's Choice schools selected for each of school improvement statuses earned during the previous year.

2005-06 School Improvement Status	2006-07 America's Choice Schools	2006-07 School Improvement Status	2007-08 America's Choice Schools	2007-08 School Improvement Status	2008-09 America's Choice Schools
SI_8	0	SI_8	0	SI_8	1
SI_7	0	SI_7	1	SI_7	2
SI_6	1	SI_6	2	SI_6	9
SI_5	3	SI_5	12	SI_5	14
SI_5(M)	0	SI_5(M)	0	SI_5(M)	1
SI_4	17	SI_4	12	SI_4	2
SI_4(M)	0	SI_4(M)	2	SI_4(M)	4
SI_3	1	SI_3	0	SI_3	0
SI_3(M)	4	SI_3(M)	0	SI_3(M)	0
SI_2	1	SI_2	0	SI_2	0
SI_2(M)	2	SI_2(M)	0	SI_2(M)	0
Alert	0	Alert	0	Alert	2
Not in School Improvement/ Meets Standards	1	Not in School Improvement/ Meets Standards	1	Not in School Improvement/ Meets Standards	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>30</b>		<b>37</b>

### Results

Of the 20 schools that received America's Choice services for three years, two got off the school improvement list by 2008-09. (A third school, Gardner-Strong Elementary, got off the school improvement list in 2006-07 and 2007-08 due to a coding error. That school was back on alert in 2009-10.) Of the 11 schools that worked with America's Choice for two years, one was removed from the school improvement list. Of the 14 schools that worked with America's Choice for just one year, two schools were removed from the list.

**America's Choice**

School	Years When Schools Received America's Choice					Years with AC	Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
HERMITAGE HIGH	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)	3	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)
GIBBS ALBRIGHT ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5(M)	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5(M)
LUCILIA WOOD ELEMENTARY	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	SI_8(M)	3	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	SI_8(M)
LYNCH DRIVE ELEMENTARY	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8
ROSE CITY MIDDLE	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8
AUGUSTA ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
CLOVERDALE MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
HUGHES HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
MARVELL HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
MILDRED JACKSON ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
OAK GROVE HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
SYLVAN HILLS MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
TURRELL HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
MARKED TREE ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_6	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_6
MARVELL PRIMARY	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	3	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5
BRINKLEY HIGH	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	3	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5

School	Years When Schools Received America's Choice					Years with AC	Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
BRADY ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A	SI_1	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A	SI_1
CEDAR PARK ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)	MS	3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)	MS
MCRAE MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_3(M)	MS	A	MS	3	SI_3	SI_3(M)	MS	A	MS
GARDNER-STRONG ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	MS*	MS	A	3	SI_3	SI_4	MS*	MS	A
TILLES ELEMENTARY	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	2	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
HERMITAGE ELEMENTARY	SI_2(M)	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	2	SI_2(M)	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)
WATSON CHAPEL JR. HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6	1	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6
COLEMAN ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_4	SI_5	1	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_4	SI_5
WYNNE JUNIOR HIGH	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	1	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5
TURRELL ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	1	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4
CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	SI_1	SI_2	SI_2(M)	MS	MS	1	SI_1	SI_2	SI_2(M)	MS	MS
PRESCOTT HIGH	A	MS	A	A	A	1	A	MS	A	A	A
CHICOT ELEMENTARY/ CHICOT PRIMARY	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6	1	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6

\* Gardner-Strong Elementary was incorrectly coded as MS in 2007 when it should have been listed as an SI\_5. The mistake was not discovered until it was too late to change it. The school's official status for that year remains MS.



School	Years When Schools Received America's Choice					Years with AC	Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
WATSON ELEMENTARY/ WATSON INTERMEDIATE	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	1	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
MILLER JUNIOR HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
HOPE HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
J.A. FAIR HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
JACKSONVILLE HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
MABELVALE MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
MCCLELLAN MAGNET HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
HENDERSON MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
EAST ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS	2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS
LEE HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
ANNA STRONG MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
FOREST HEIGHTS MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
WHITTEN ELEMENTARY	No grades tested	No grades tested	No grades tested	SI_4	SI_5	1	No grades tested	No grades tested	No grades tested	SI_4	SI_5
CLARENDON HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5
BLEVINS ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS	1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS
CROSS COUNTY HIGH	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A	1	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A

## Scholastic Audit

A scholastic audit is a detailed review of a school's learning environment, efficiency, and academic performance. ADE contracts with individual educators and sends them to selected schools to perform the audits. The audit teams analyze the strengths and limitations of the schools' instructional and organizational effectiveness and make recommendations to improve teaching and learning. Schools are measured against nine general standards, and a scholastic audit provides the schools with three to five recommendations for each standard.

### School Selection

Rule 9.12 of the Rules Governing the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program and the Academic Distress Program requires schools in year three, four or five of school improvement to participate in a scholastic audit. ADE conducted a scholastic audit for 34 schools during the 2006-07 school year, 30 schools in 2007-08 and 32 in 2008-09, for a total of 96 schools. No school received an audit more than once. Another 32 schools are scheduled for or already have had a scholastic audit during the 2009-10 school year.

In 2006-07, there were 81 schools in school improvement year three or higher that did not receive a scholastic audit. The next year 70 schools in year three or higher did not receive an audit. (That figure does not include the schools in advanced stages of school improvement that received a scholastic audit the previous year, nor does it include 20 schools that were in school improvement year three, but were meeting standards.) In 2008-09, 80 schools in year three or higher did not receive an audit. (That figure does not include the schools in advanced stages of school improvement that received a scholastic audit the previous two years, nor does it include 14 schools that were in school improvement year three or year four, but were meeting standards.)

The following table shows the number of schools selected for a scholastic audit for each school improvement status earned during the previous year.

2005-06 School Improvement Status	2006-07 Scholastic Audit Schools	2006-07 School Improvement Status	2007-08 Scholastic Audit Schools	2007-08 School Improvement Status	2008-09 Scholastic Audit Schools
SI_6	1	SI_6	0	SI_6	0
SI_5	3	SI_5	0	SI_5	10
SI_5(M)	0	SI_5(M)	0	SI_5(M)	0
SI_4	23	SI_4	20	SI_4	13
SI_4(M)	0	SI_4(M)	0	SI_4(M)	3
SI_3	1	SI_3	2	SI_3	2
SI_3(M)	6	SI_3(M)	8	SI_3(M)	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>		<b>30</b>		<b>32</b>

### Results

Of the schools that received a scholastic audit in 2006-07, two were removed from the school improvement list by 2008-09. Two other schools — one audited in 2007-08 and another audited in 2008-09 — were also removed from the school improvement list.

## Scholastic Audit

School	Year When Schools Received Scholastic Audit					Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
HERMITAGE HIGH	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)
GIBBS ALBRIGHT ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5(M)
LUCILIA WOOD ELEMENTARY	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	SI_8(M)	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	SI_8(M)
LYNCH DRIVE ELEMENTARY	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8
ROSE CITY MIDDLE	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_8
AUGUSTA ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
CLOVERDALE MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
HUGHES HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
MARVELL HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
MILDRED JACKSON ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
OAK GROVE HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
SYLVAN HILLS MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
TURRELL HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
MARKED TREE ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_6	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_6
MARVELL PRIMARY	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5
BRINKLEY HIGH	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5

School	Year When Schools Received Scholastic Audit					Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
BRADY ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A	SI_1	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A	SI_1
CEDAR PARK ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)	MS	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)	MS
MCRAE MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_3(M)	MS	A	MS	SI_3	SI_3(M)	MS	A	MS
GARDNER-STRONG ELEMENTARY*	SI_3	SI_4	MS*	MS	A	SI_3	SI_4	MS*	MS	A
TILLES ELEMENTARY	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
WATSON ELEMENTARY/ WATSON INTERMEDIATE	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
WATSON CHAPEL JR. HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6
COLEMAN ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_4	SI_5
WYNNE JUNIOR HIGH	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5
CHICOT ELEMENTARY/ CHICOT PRIMARY	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_5	SI_6
MILLER JUNIOR HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
JACKSON ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_5(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_5(M)
WONDER ELEMENTARY	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_6(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_6(M)

\* Gardner-Strong Elementary was incorrectly coded as MS in 2007 when it should have been listed as an SI\_5. The mistake was not discovered until it was too late to change it. The school's official status for that year remains MS.

School	Year When Schools Received Scholastic Audit					Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
DORA KIMMONS JR. HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
JACK ROBEY JR. HIGH	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
WILLIAM O. DARBY JR. HIGH SCH.	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_7
BOB COURTWAY MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5
CARL STUART MIDDLE	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5
ARKANSAS HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
HOPE HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
J.A. FAIR HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
JACKSONVILLE HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
MABELVALE MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
MCCLELLAN MAGNET HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
EAST ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS
LEE HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
CLARENDON HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5
SO MISS COUNTY ELEM AT LUXORA	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_5(M)
BEARDEN MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)

School	Year When Schools Received Scholastic Audit					Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
FORDYCE ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4(M)
CENTRAL HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
FORREST CITY HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
HALL HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
LAKEWOOD MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
NLR HIGH - EAST CAMPUS	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
NLR HIGH - WEST CAMPUS	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
NORTH HEIGHTS JR. HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
NORTHSIDE HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
PINE BLUFF HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
RIVERCREST HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
ANNA STRONG ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5
BELAIR MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
JONESBORO HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5
OAK PARK ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5
WASHINGTON MAGNET ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_5
MURRELL TAYLOR ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_4

School	Year When Schools Received Scholastic Audit					Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
THIRTY-FOURTH AVE. ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4
FRANKLIN INCENTIVE ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_2	SI_3
TURRELL ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4
HENDERSON MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
ANNA STRONG MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
FOREST HEIGHTS MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
BLEVINS ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	MS
CROSS COUNTY HIGH	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	A
ANNIE CAMP JR. HIGH	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)
STEPHENS HIGH	SI_1(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_1(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)
ARKADELPHIA HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
JOE T. ROBINSON HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
MONTICELLO HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
NORTH PULASKI HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
TRUSTY ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6

School	Year When Schools Received Scholastic Audit					Impact on School Improvement Status				
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
WEST MEMPHIS HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
WILBUR D. MILLS HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
GOSNELL HIGH	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_4(M)	SI_5
BLYTHEVILLE HIGH	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
EARLE HIGH	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
FORREST CITY JR. HIGH	SI_1(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_1(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
HARRY C. MORRISON ELEMENTARY	SI_2(M)	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2(M)	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
LAKESIDE HIGH	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
MCGEHEE HIGH	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
OSCEOLA HIGH	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
OSCEOLA MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
HOWARD ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
MALVERN HIGH	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
SYLVAN HILLS HIGH	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5
DOLLARWAY HIGH	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_1	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4
SEVENTH STREET ELEMENTARY	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4
UNION ELEMENTARY	SI_1(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4	SI_1(M)	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_4
DREW CENTRAL HIGH	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4
DERMOTT HIGH	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_2	SI_2	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_2



**Scholastic Audit: 2009-10**

The following schools have already received a scholastic audit this school year (2009-10) or are scheduled to receive one.

School	District	2008-09 School Improvement Status
LANDMARK ELEMENTARY	PULASKI CO. SPECIAL	SI_6
FULLER MIDDLE	PULASKI CO. SPECIAL	SI_6
FORDYCE HIGH	FORDYCE	SI_5
HOT SPRINGS MIDDLE	HOT SPRINGS	SI_6
PULASKI HEIGHTS MIDDLE	LITTLE ROCK	SI_5(M)
SILOAM SPRINGS MIDDLE	SILOAM SPRINGS	SI_5(M)
CROSSETT HIGH	CROSSETT	SI_5
NO. HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY	N. LITTLE ROCK	SI_5
STEPHENS ELEMENTARY	STEPHENS	SI_5
WATSON CHAPEL HIGH	WATSON CHAPEL	SI_5
MINERAL SPRINGS HIGH	MINERAL SPRINGS.	SI_4(M)
SUNNYMEDE ELEMENTARY	FORT SMITH	SI_5
SUTTON ELEMENTARY	FORT SMITH	SI_5
CUTTER-MORNING STAR HIGH	CUTTER-MORNING STAR	SI_4(M)
HOT SPRINGS HIGH	HOT SPRINGS	SI_4(M)
DEWITT MIDDLE	DEWITT	SI_4
BLYTHEVILLE MIDDLE	BLYTHEVILLE	SI_5
COLLEGE HILL MIDDLE	TEXARKANA	SI_5
MARION HIGH	MARION	SI_3(M)
LAFAYETTE COUNTY HIGH	LAFAYETTE COUNTY	SI_4
STEWART ELEMENTARY	FORREST CITY	SI_4
DOLLARWAY MIDDLE	DOLLARWAY	SI_4
JACKSONVILLE ELEMENTARY	PULASKI CO. SPECIAL	SI_4
CENTRAL HIGH	LITTLE ROCK	SI_4
MEADOWCLIFF ELEMENTARY	LITTLE ROCK	SI_3(M)
DUNBAR MIDDLE	EARLE	SI_3(M)
WAKEFIELD ELEMENTARY	LITTLE ROCK	SI_3(M)
PALESTINE-WHEATLEY MIDDLE	PALESTINE-WHEATLEY	SI_3(M)
RUSSELLVILLE HIGH	RUSSELLVILLE	SI_3(M)
WALDRON HIGH	WALDRON	SI_3(M)
WEAVER ELEMENTARY	WEST MEMPHIS	SI_3(M)
WHITTEN ELEMENTARY	LEE COUNTY	SI_5
<b>TOTAL: 32 Schools</b>		

## **Arkansas Leadership Academy's School Support Program**

Act 1229 of 2005 created the School Support Program, a state-funded initiative of the Arkansas Leadership Academy (Ark. Code Ann. 6-15-440). Program staff work with selected schools in school improvement to build the schools' leadership capacity, train the leadership team and work with school and district staff to improve student achievement. The School Support Program provides experienced academic coaches to work with the selected schools on a regular basis and develops incentive programs for institutions and program participants.

### School Selection

Schools in school improvement apply for services, and the Leadership Academy selects the ones that will participate in the program. Twenty schools applied to participate in the program's pilot year, 2006-07, and four were selected. Nine schools applied for services in 2007-08, but the Leadership Academy continued working only with the four pilot schools. The Leadership Academy did not accept any new applications in 2008-09 and continued providing services to three of the original four schools. (The fourth school, England Middle School, closed in 2008 for financial reasons.) The selected schools were all in year 2 of school improvement.

### Results

Of the four schools in the School Support Program, one school was removed from the school improvement list.

### School Support Program

School	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
FORDYCE MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6	SI_2	SI_3	SI_4	SI_5	SI_6
GENTRY MIDDLE	SI_2	SI_2(M)	MS	MS	MS	SI_2	SI_2(M)	MS	MS	MS
MANILA MIDDLE*	NA	NA	NA	NA	A	NA	NA	NA	NA	A
MANILA ELEMENTARY*	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4	SI_2	SI_2(M)	SI_3	SI_3	SI_4
MANILA HIGH*		A	SI_1	SI_1	SI_2		A	SI_1	SI_1	SI_2
ENGLAND MIDDLE*	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_3(M)	CLOSED	SI_2	SI_3	SI_3(M)	SI_3(M)	CLOSED

\* The School Support Program works with grades 5-8 in the Manila School District. The Manila Middle School, with grades 5-8, was created in 2008 and opened for its first school year, 2008-09. Prior to the middle school's creation, the School Support Program worked with grades 5 and 6 in the elementary school and grades 7 and 8 in the high school.

### School Support: 2009-10

The School Support Program is currently working with 17 schools, including one of the program's schools during the previous three years (Fordyce Middle).

School	District	2008-09 School Improvement Status
LANDMARK ELEMENTARY	PULASKI CO. SPECIAL	SI_6
FORDYCE HIGH	FORDYCE	SI_5
WHITTEN ELEMENTARY	LEE COUNTY	SI_5
HUGHES K-12 SCHOOL	HUGHES	SI_7*
SYLVAN HILLS MIDDLE	PULASKI CO. SPECIAL	SI_7
OAK GROVE HIGH SCHOOL	PULASKI CO. SPECIAL	SI_7
GIBBS ALBRIGHT ELEMENTARY	NEWPORT	SI_5(M)
MARKED TREE ELEMENTARY	MARKED TREE	SI_6
ANNA STRONG MIDDLE	LEE COUNTY	SI_6
LEE HIGH SCHOOL	LEE COUNTY	SI_6
SO MISS COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AT LUXORA	SO. MISS. COUNTY	SI_5(M)
FORDYCE MIDDLE	FORDYCE	SI_6
ARKANSAS HIGH	TEXARKANA	SI_6
FORDYCE ELEMENTARY	FORDYCE	SI_4(M)
MURRELL TAYLOR ELEMENTARY	PULASKI CO. SPECIAL	SI_4
NEWPORT JUNIOR HIGH	NEWPORT	SI_5
RIVERCREST JUNIOR HIGH	SO. MISS. COUNTY	SI_2(M)

\* Hughes High School combined with Mildred Jackson Elementary School beginning with the 2009-10 school year. Both schools were in year 7 of school improvement in the 2008-09 school year.

## Summary Conclusion

This report reviewed three state programs that identify and help struggling schools in Arkansas: America's Choice, scholastic audit and the School Support Program. The report examined year-over-year changes in the school improvement status of schools that received services from these programs.

- Of the 20 schools that received America's Choice services for three years, two got off the school improvement list by 2008-09. One of the 11 schools that worked with America's Choice for two years was removed from the school improvement list.
- Of the 34 schools that received a scholastic audit in 2006-07, two were removed from the school improvement list by 2008-09. One of the 30 schools audited in 2007-08 and one of the 32 schools audited in 2008-09 were also removed from the school improvement list.
- Of the four schools in the School Support Program, one school was removed from the school improvement list.

While this report did not detect widespread improvement in the school improvement statuses of schools that received extra support, it is important to keep in mind that the programs' full impact on student achievement may not be revealed through changes in school improvement status alone. While a school's status may have worsened, its student test scores may have actually improved. Measuring the success of these programs by the changes in school improvement status should be considered the first step in evaluating the programs' effectiveness. Additional analysis may be needed.