Performance Management Plan - Narrative:

For the past five years Dine Southwest High School has experienced stagnant growth within the content area of Mathematics as measured by the AIMS testing. With its very small enrollment, Dine Southwest High School averages from 3 to 4 students whose test scores are used for representation of an overall student enrollment of 35 students.

Since a revised curriculum development began 3 years ago, the school has a systematic process for monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing the curriculum. The school curriculum is monitored, and revised annually based on multiple factors such as local curriculum, state standards, student performance on state assessment, student academic needs defined from other sources. The curriculum is communicated and disseminated to all staff, students, and families during the review. Evaluation is based on student results where modifications are then made as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

The school has established a uniform format for curriculum guides, and a timetable for revising them. Curriculum Guides developed by the school are content-based and include assessment items. Guides have been updated for Physical Education and Language Arts, and most recently, Educational Technology. The Language Arts Guides were completed in August and were in the hands of the teachers in August 2011. The staff is currently working on the curriculum guide for Mathematics and hopes to complete it by December 2011. The guides outline the content standards by grade level for the subject area, detail the AIMS objectives in testing these standards, indicate the content alignment to the relevant pages in the adopted textbook, and suggest teaching strategies to address the content standards. The Curriculum Guides also suggests quarterly time lines for coverage of specific major areas of the content. The school has attempted to adjust the coverage of the curriculum to focus on content before it is tested on the AIMS. The school has not provided training opportunity for teachers to become aware of the new curriculum guides and how to effectively implement within the classroom. Teachers are currently not adequately prepared to explain the scope and sequence of the curriculum within each grade level and across grade levels in each content area.

The school has revised its course descriptions for grades 9-12 for distribution to students and parents. The school has implemented the ECAP program, which encourages 9th -12th graders to map out a planned program of courses through graduation, which parents would acknowledge and sign. The map reflects the new graduation requirements for class of 2012 and 2013. The school now requires three years of math, including Algebra I and Geometry, as a graduation requirement for the current school year. The school needs to continue the implementation of its revised curriculum and continue to conduct evaluations to determine the effectiveness of the ongoing revisions.

To ensure full integration of the Arizona State Standards into mathematics and reading instruction, informal classroom observations have been used to monitor all students' active engagement in the learning activities and tasks, to observe that students have access to the resources necessary to complete their work, observe that students independently use technology for a variety of purposes. A checklist is planned to be used for this current school year to indicate findings in the following areas: lesson delivery and the development of lesson plans, the condition of classrooms and whether the environment is student centered, the availability of

instructional materials, the implementation of a writing program, the availability of a test preparation plan, the availability of a variety of safety net strategies to support at risk students, and the protection of instructional time. Summary reports of findings are shared with the board of directors after the visitation is concluded. The report identifies recommendations made by the principal for follow-up action before the next formal classroom observation.

Further, lesson plans are monitored during bi-weekly team meeting basis to ensure that all instructional activities are aligned to instructional objectives and Arizona State Standards. During team meetings, lesson plans for the coming two weeks and to collaborate on practice activities that are aligned with concept and thinking level of the lesson objective. In addition, lesson plans include review and re-teaching component in the instructional planning. However, teachers have limited experience with differentiated instruction. Differentiated instruction is not observable in all classrooms. There is difficulty with access to resources to direct teachers to using a wide variety of scientifically research-based instructional strategies.

Within the past two years, the school has implemented the use of a computer assessment program, iSTEEP (System to Enhance Educational Performance). Since its implementation, the school has been able to use a universal screening assessment to gauge student reading and math abilities to use as baseline data. Within the iSTEEP program, the school has developed benchmark assessments in reading, writing, and math to guide instruction. Benchmark assessments are given quarterly to guide instruction and measure growth over times. Data is collected on a quarterly basis to determine student growth over a quarter period of time. The school uses local criterion- referenced tests, performance assessment, classroom summative assessments, final projects, AIMS & Stanford 10 to evaluate student performance.

The school is in the process of developing and employing structured and focused pre- and post assessments to guide instruction to guide instruction in content and delivery for a specific concept and performance objective. Teachers are working on improving collaboration to design formative assessments that are aligned to standards/ performance objectives and retaining a consistent depth of knowledge. In addition, rubrics/scoring guides are in the process of being strengthened to reflect AIMS rubrics and scoring guides for summative assessments.

The iSTEEP program allows the school to implement a Response to Intervention program to identify underperforming students. However, the school needs to strengthen the necessary support needed for underperforming students, such as implementation of effective instructional strategies.

To keep instructional staff informed and updated on scientifically based instruction, the school has yet to provide a clearly defined evaluation process that focuses directly on increasing student achievement. There are written policies regarding evaluation of teachers, but it does not address goals for improving student learning. The evaluation has little connection to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards.

Analysis of student performance needs to guide the focus of the school professional development plan. Due to remote location of the school, external consultation is limited. Most professional development attained is attended as a requirement from Arizona Department of Education, such as AIMS workshop, English Language Learner Assessments (AZELLA), and Special Education requirements.
The school reviews student data on a quarterly basis. Data from a variety of sources are collected and reviewed and compiled into graphs for evaluation. Data reviewed are attendance, disciplinary records, benchmark testing, and performance based assessments, projects, and skills checklist for individual student performance. However, instructional team needs more professional development in how to disaggregate data and identify trends, determine what aggregated achievement data say about our overall performance of our student's achievement.

According to AIMS Math data for the past five years, the school has not shown growth. Further data shows that 79.8% of students in each cohort Fall Far Below in Math. Overall average mean math scores for each cohort did not show significant growth. Students who have attended school for more than one year at the same school perform better than students who have attended less than a year.

AIMS Reading data for the past five years demonstrate a limited growth for two years, but did not meet the state average of 64%. An analysis of enrollment trends had an effect on student proficiency growth. During the years of 2007 and 2008, more students were tested, thus giving a higher average. However, during the years of 2008 and 2009, fewer students were tested, due to a decrease in enrollment. Student growth averages were taken from 4-5 students from the last two years.

The proposed Performance Management Plan addresses the subject areas in greatest need of improvement which is increased math proficiency for all cohorts and implementation an effective assessment system. One priority to address this concern is re-evaluating our current comprehensive assessment system to identify gaps in curriculum for instructional implications. Secondly, to develop and provide a comprehensive professional growth plan that focuses on improving academic achievement and that can be evaluated on a regular basis. Professional development will need to focus on needs of our school in the areas of assessment systems and data driven instructional planning. This professional development plan needs to be based on an analysis of student performance and program effectiveness, incorporate the most current research on content and methodologies, and is linked to our school's improvement goals. Each staff member will have an individual Professional Development plan that is designed to complement improving academic achievement and include an assessment of that staff member's strengths and weaknesses.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Developing Innovations in Navajo Education, Inc. - Dine Southwest High School

INDICATOR:[1] _X__Math _X__Reading **DURATION OF THE PLAN**[2]**:** Begins **September**, **2011** to **September**, **2012**

MEASURE*	METRIC*	CURRENT STATUS*	End Target For This Plan*[3]
State standardized assessment	Percent (%) of students who score proficient on the State standardized assessment and Student growth percentile (SGP)	(Board staff will enter info here)	Meet or demonstrate sufficient progress toward the level of adequate academic performance as set and modified periodically by the Board.

STRATEGY I: Provide and implement a curriculum that improves student achievement.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Provide teachers with opportunities to become aware of the curriculum guides and its overall design, particularly how it differs from the past.	09/01/2011-12/01/2011	Principal	Agenda of meetings and sign-in sheet.	
2. Provide adequate training for teachers to be able to explain the scope and sequence of the curriculum within each grade level and across grade level in each content area.	09/01/2011-05/30/2011	Principal	Agenda of trainings	300.00
3. Provide consultation with teachers on differentiated instruction and research based instructional strategies.	09/01/2011-09/01/2011	Principal	Agenda of trainings	300.00
4. Develop structured and focused assessments to guide instruction in content and specific concept and performance objective.	09/01/2011-05/30/2011	Principal	Revised assessments aligned to lesson plans	
5. Strengthen rubrics/scoring guides to reflect AIMS rubrics for summative assessments.	09/01/2011-12/01/2011	Principal	Revised rubrics/scoring guides	
6. Provide training for staff on how to	09/01/2011-	Principal	Agenda of training	300.00

disaggregate data and use data to drive instructional decisions and for curriculum evaluation.	12/30/2011			
7. Complete Mathematics alignment to State Standards.	09/01/2011-12/01/2011	Principal	Curriculum alignment	

STRATEGY II: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring the integration of the Arizona Academic Standards into instruction.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Evaluate teacher competency on scope and sequence of curriculum and implication on instruction by formal teacher interview.	09/01/2011-05/30/2012	Principal	Formal interview questionnaire	
2. Conduct formal classroom observations to monitor the use of research-based instructional strategies and differentiated instruction.	09/01/2011-05/30/2012	Principal	Classroom observation tool	
3. Monitor use of structured and focused assessments in content and specific concept and performance objectives in lesson plan.	09/01/2011-05/30/2012	Principal	Random Sampling of Lesson Plans	

STRATEGY III: Develop and implement a plan for monitoring and documenting student proficiency.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Conduct meetings to discuss student achievement data at the school, classroom, and individual level to determine classroom-based decisions.	0901/2011-05/30/2012	Principal	Meeting minutes and sign-in.	
2. Conduct meetings to discuss intervention strategies and progress on underperforming students.	09/01/2011-05/30/2012	Principal	Meeting minutes and sign-in.	

STRATEGY IV: Develop and implement a professional development plan that supports effective implementation of the curriculum.

Action Steps [4]	Timeline	Responsible Party	Evidence of Meeting Action Steps	Budget
1. Assess areas current reality of professional development.	09/01/2011-09/30/2011	Principal	Identification of adult learning needs based on student needs. Determinations of priorities.	
2. Develop professional development goals and action plan for each goal.	10/01/2011-10/14/2011	Principal	Establishment of goal along with action plan.	
3. Determine professional development opportunities: team based learning, online learning, and workshops.	10/17/2011-10/28/2011	Principal	Develop calendar of scheduled opportunities.	1200.00
4. Develop ongoing assessment and evaluation of the professional development plan.	01/01/2012-07/01/2012	Principal	Analysis of the impact of the professional development plan on student learning.	

Using the information entered in the "Budget" columns above, please provide a budget total that incorporates all strategies and action steps for each year of the performance management plan's implementation. For "Year 1", please specify the fiscal year (e.g., 2011). The charter holder may add years, as necessary.

Year 1: 2011 **Budget Total** _**$2100.00**_____ **Fiscal Year** 2011-2012
Year 2: **Budget Total** _____
Year 3: **Budget Total** _____

Notes:
* Provided by ASBCS staff
1 Academic area to be addressed for improvement
2 Duration of the plan must align with the timeline presented in the Action Steps
3 Refer to the Board's level of adequate academic performance
4 Repeat these action steps as necessary to include the appropriate number of steps to accomplish the strategy