**2012-13-West Carroll Special School District Strategic Plan**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District Name: | West Carroll SSD | | |
| Accountability status: | *Intermediate* | | |
| Analysis of last year’s final results: | Areas of Greatest Progress: | Areas of Greatest Challenge: | |
| **AMOs**  7th Math-Goal-30.7 Actual Score-41.8  Surpassed goal  Alg I-Goal -59.5 Actual Score-65.1  Surpassed goal  **Gap Closure**  3-8 Reading(ED)-Goal 14.8 Actual Score-8.2  Surpassed goal  Alg I (ED)-Goal 27.4 Actual Score-16.9  Surpassed goal | **AMOs**  3rd Math-Goal 56.8 Actual Score-31.8  Did not meet goal  Eng. II-Goal 63.9 Actual Score-50.6  Did not meet goal  **Gap Closure**  3-8 Math(ED)-Goal 8.7 Actual Score-14.7  Did not meet goal  3-8 Math(SWD)-Goal 24.9 Actual Score-26.8 Did not meet goal  English II (ED)-Goal 27.8 Actual Score-31.7  Did not meet goal | |
| Underlying Reasons for Progress: | Underlying Reasons for Challenge: | |
| Evidence from TEAM evaluations indicates that teachers in these areas concentrate instruction on state standards. They also use analysis of data information developed with support of data coach to determine weak areas of instruction and search for alternate strategies for strengthening these areas. The Response for Intervention Program used in the district is more highly developed for reading than for math. | One staff member is responsible for English II at the high school level. Since this was her first year to teacher, she has limited experience. Evidence from TEAM evaluations indicate that math teachers concentrate on skills instruction rather than concept instruction plus instructional time is lost at the beginning of the school year by extensive review of skills taught the previous year. | |
| Goals for 2012-13 school year: | *\*Note: no need to fill in this box, but please reference your AMO targets (available when you log in at* [*http://www.tn.gov/education/mleaops.shtml*](http://www.tn.gov/education/mleaops.shtml) *under “Accountability Data”) for Achievement and Gap Closure in completing the rest of this document.*  *3-8 Math(ED) Gap 2011-2012-14.7% Gap Target 2012-2013-13.8%*  *3-8 Math(SWD) Gap 2011-2012-26.8% Gap Target 2012-2013-25.1%* | | |
| Plan for this school year: | Key strategies to achieve goals: | | |
| 1. **Strategy: Professional Development for math teachers grades 3-8.**   **Implementation Plan: All math teachers, including teachers of SWD, in grades 3-8 attended the three day state sponsored Common Core Math Training during the summer of 2012.**  **Desired outcomes: Strategies learned during the training will be implemented in classrooms for this school year. Principals will note this implementation during TEAM evaluations.**  **Projected costs and funding sources: Teacher Stipends for time and expenses for the training of $1000 each. Total cost-$8000. Source Title IIA**  **Implementation of this specific strategy will provide teachers with professional development they can use to improve teaching math concepts which is an area of challenge from 2011-2012.**   1. **Strategy: Data Coach**   **Implementation Plan: The district employed a data coach for the first time last year. This position will be funded again this year. The data coach will construct formative assessments, help teachers administer the assessments, analyze data, share the results with teachers, and help teachers identify strategies to assist low-performing students. Teachers will establish individual class goals for advancing students to proficiency.**  **Desired outcomes: Teachers will meet with data coach after each assessment to discuss test results paying particular attention to economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities. Strategies for improving student performance will be identified.**  **Projected costs and funding sources: Salary with benefits-$44,000. Source RTTTP**  **This specific strategy was instrumental in achieving reading goals for the 2011-2012 school year. Therefore it should be continued for the coming year. Successful strategies used for E/LA will be applied to math. The data coach will use the AMO results to help teachers align instructional strategies to specific needs of low-performing students for gap closures.**   1. **Strategy: Formative Assessments**   **Implementation Plan: Limelight Formative Assessments will be given four times during the school year. The data coach will share information from the tests with teachers. Teachers with assistance from the data coach will identify areas of weakness in the curriculum and low performing students. Teachers will reteach standards from identified areas of weakness and remediate low performing students.**  **Desired outcomes: Data from the assessments will be used to determine student progress. Student performance will improve on state assessments.**  **Projected costs and funding sources: Limelight-$9000 Funding Source: Title I and Title VI**  **This specific strategy provides information to teachers regarding student mastery of state standards throughout the school year. With the information, teachers are able to adjust their instruction to meet the needs of students.**   1. **Strategy: Improve Response to Intervention Program for Math**   **Implementation Plan: Administrators will review math RTI program. Additional dedicated time for math RTI will be added to low-performing students’ schedules.**  **Desired outcomes: Providing additional time for math instruction for low-achieving students will increase their performance on state assessments.**  **Projected costs and funding sources: None**  **This strategy has helped West Carroll students achieve proficiency in reading. Improving RTI for math will provide additional time for students to master math standards which will help them achieve proficiency on state assessments.** | | |
|  | Benchmark: | | Timeline: |
| Benchmark 1: Teachers will set classroom baseline for reading and math as the number of students scoring proficient and advanced from 2011-2012 school year | | August, 2012 |
| Benchmark 2: 1 additional student over the baseline established for reading and math will score proficient or advanced | | September 2012 |
| Benchmark 3: 2 additional students over the baseline established for reading and math will score proficient or advanced | | November 2012 |
|  | Benchmark 4: 3 additional students over the baseline established for reading and math will score proficient or advanced | | January 2013 |
|  | Benchmark 5: 4 additional students over the baseline established for reading and math will score proficient or advanced | | March 2013 |