



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Desoto County High School

1710 E GIBSON ST

Arcadia, FL 34266

863-494-3434

<http://dhs.desotoschools.com/>

School Demographics

School Type

High School

Title I

Yes

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate

71%

Alternative/ESE Center

No

Charter School

No

Minority Rate

59%

School Grades History

2013-14

C

2012-13

C

2011-12

B

2010-11

D

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
Differentiated Accountability	5
Part I: Current School Status	6
Part II: Expected Improvements	15
Goals Summary	21
Goals Detail	21
Action Plan for Improvement	24
Part III: Coordination and Integration	32
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	33
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	37

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Desoto County High School

Principal

Nelson Stephenson

School Advisory Council chair

Tim Backer

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Nelson Stephenson	Principal
Tod Baldwin	Assistant Principal
Tim Backer	SAC Chair
Katherine Knoche	Dean
Cynthia Barrera	Dean
Arah Show	Coach
Ann Daniel	Coach
Jayne Arrington	Coach
Angela Brough	Guidance
Cole Connors	Guidance
Laurel Padgett	Coach
Mark Pryor	Assistant Principal
Leslie Bickett	Guidance

District-Level Information

District

Desoto

Superintendent

Dr. Karyn Gary

Date of school board approval of SIP

9/24/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Tim Backer Chairperson

Vice Chair Barbara Foster-Jackson

Treasurer Mary Pete Martin
Secretary Dana Holloman

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

SAC has oversight and input capabilities and has voted on acceptance of the document in full.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

Being an effective voice for promoting the interests of the school and students, and actively supporting the school in meeting the educational, social and recreational needs of students
Strengthening both the governance and operating structure of School Council, including improving communications between Council and the school community.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

We are going to purchase items and open a school Positive Behavior Support store. Approximately \$5,000 will be budgeted for this line. Other funds are to be distributed as SAC deems necessary.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Nelson Stephenson

Principal

Years as Administrator: 11

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

Bachelors of Science. Political Science/Economics, Western Carolina University; Masters in Public Administration Western Carolina University; Masters in Educational Leadership, Florida Gulf Coast University

Performance Record

2012- DeSoto Middle School Grade: D,
2011- Gulfview Middle School Grade: A,
Reading Mastery; 80%, Math Mastery;
85%, Science Mastery 67%. Lowest 25% making reading learning gains; 64%.
Lowest 25% making gains in math; 75%. AYP: 82%.
2010- Iely High School Grade: B, Reading
Mastery; 61%, Math Mastery; 65%, Science Mastery; 28%.
Lowest 25%
reading; 74%. Lowest 25% math; 71%.
AYP; 90%, Black and Hispanic did not make AYP in Reading.
2009- Naples High School Grade: B,
Reading Mastery; 55%, Math Mastery;
82%, Science Mastery; 50%. Lowest 25% reading; 41%. Lowest
25% math; 63%. AYP; 70%.
2008- Naples High School Grade: A,
Reading Mastery; 61%, Math Mastery;
85%, Science Mastery; 53%. Lowest 25% reading; 74%. Lowest
25% math; 71%. AYP; 90%.

Tod Baldwin

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 20

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

B.S. Education, Miami University
Master of Sports Management, Bowling Green State University
Principal License, Wright State University
Vocational Teacher License – State of Ohio
Assistant Supt., Elementary Principal, High School Principal
License- State of Ohio
Educational Leadership(all levels) Certificate – State of Florida

Performance Record

2012 – Fairborn High School(Ohio) – Rating of Excellent
2011 – Butler Tech (CTC)(Ohio) – not rated
2010 – Butler Tech (CTC)(Ohio) – not rated
2009 – Butler Tech (CTC)(Ohio) – not rated
2008 - Butler Tech (CTC)(Ohio) – not rated

Mark Pryor

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 1

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

University of Scranton-Scranton, PA
 Master of Science in Educational Leadership, 2012
 King's College-Wilkes-Barre, PA
 Bachelor of Arts in History, 2000
 Secondary Education Certification, 2003

Performance Record

Desoto County High School- Arcadia, FL
 February 2013-Present
 Grade: D

Instructional Coaches**# of instructional coaches**

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:**Arah Show**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 5

Years at Current School: 1

Areas

Reading/Literacy

Credentials

BA: Organizational Communications
 Teaching Certifications: 5-9 English, 6-12 English, Reading
 Endorsed, ESOL Endorsed
 Masters in Education: Curriculum and Instruction: Reading

Performance Record

2011-2012: School Grade B; 37% Mastery in Reading; 69%
 Mastery in Writing

Ann Daniel

Part-time / District-based

Years as Coach: 3

Years at Current School: 1

Areas

Science

Credentials

Masters Education Technology, American College of Education,
 Bachelors Chemistry, University of South Florida

Performance Record

Laurel Padgett

Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 3
Areas	Other	
Credentials	BS: Business	
Performance Record	2011-2012 – School Grade B; 37% mastery in Reading, 59% Mastery in Math, 69% Mastery in Writing;	

Jayne Arrington

Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 3
Areas	Mathematics	
Credentials	BS Math; MS Math Education	
Performance Record	2011-2012 – School Grade B; 37% mastery in Reading, 59% Mastery in Math, 69% Mastery in Writing;	

Classroom Teachers**# of classroom teachers**

70

receiving effective rating or higher

51, 73%

Highly Qualified Teachers

77%

certified in-field

64, 91%

ESOL endorsed

15, 21%

reading endorsed

8, 11%

with advanced degrees

29, 41%

National Board Certified

, 0%

first-year teachers

15, 21%

with 1-5 years of experience

22, 31%

with 6-14 years of experience

22, 31%

with 15 or more years of experience

15, 21%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

9

Highly Qualified

100, 1111%

Other Instructional Personnel**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above****# receiving effective rating or higher****Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies**

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

The District has developed a Mentorship Program to allow new teachers the opportunity to become comfortable with the policies and procedures of our school as they settle in their curriculum areas. The Principal and Assistant Principals will be holding meetings with new teachers to ensure they are receiving all resources necessary for success. Training will be aligned to needs of new teachers and will cover areas such as discipline, attendance, classroom management, lesson planning and other related topics. This program will be overseen by Mr. Tod Baldwin, Assistant Principal.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Mentor and mentee meet daily to discuss evidence-based strategies for effective classroom teaching as well as help with the every day process and routines. The mentor is paid a stipend by the district. The mentor and mentee also meet bi-weekly with administration and met during preschool week for district orientation of the school process. Pairing of mentor/mentee has a variety of reasons some of which include: Mentor and mentee share curriculum subjects, the experienced mentor is in close proximity, and/or the mentor has had a successful track record in assisting the school in retaining new teachers.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The MTSS and SIP monitoring is a combination of the use of a district database, guidance/teacher referrals, and administration classroom observations. The data routinely monitored for Tier I interventions in reading and math are the students Reading FCAT scores and a baseline reading (FAIR) and math score (FCAT Explorer Math, and EOC Scores. For writing, the students' writing scores would be used as a data source, as well as previous grades in English classes. For science, the MTSS team would examine the students' previous grades in science classes as well as any ELL, ESE, or 504 plan data that may be available. For behavior, the data routinely monitored would be ESE, ELL, 504 Plan, and discipline history for each student. For Tier II and III interventions, the monitoring instrument will be the intervention records and progress monitoring paperwork.

SIP data is used to make decisions about modifications needed to the core curriculum and school-wide approach to behavior management. The administration monitors the implementation of interventions supporting teachers in personalizing the student's education, which will increase student achievement. Professional Development for utilizing the MTSS/SIP problem solving process is scheduled early in the school year and is on-going as needed.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

The Rtl Leadership Team, including the Principal will meet with the School Advisory Council to help develop the SIP. The team will provide and review data, plan interventions, and continuously evaluate status of interventions and staff development needed regarding Rtl. The team will assist teachers in using and analyzing data, support teachers in providing interventions, and involve parents in the Rtl process.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The team will meet monthly to engage in the following activities:

Review data and link to instructional decisions; review the progress monitoring data at each grade level and classroom levels to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the information the team will identify professional development and use available school resources. The team will also collaborate to problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. In essence, the Plan, Do, Act, Check model will be used in implementing it's goal. Based on needs the team will also identify and implement professional development and resources.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) will be the data management system for reading data from the FAIR. Performance Matters will be used to provide data in an analyzed format from math progress monitoring as well as all lagging and leading data. Gradebook, Compass Learning, and Genesis will be used for other housing and accessing other data, such as science, state assessment scores, attendance and discipline, and current academic performance in the classroom. The district is still considering how to provide an efficient and effective system for collecting and organizing other progress monitoring data. The leadership team will summarize and disseminate data from all tiers to the school faculty and staff.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

District resources and personnel will assist in implementation and training of staff. In-house administration will provide opportunities for training and will model implementation of MTSS through

multiple channels. Guidance and teachers will have full administrative support in developing and implementing MTSS. Staff will be required to discuss data utilizing an in-house prepared brochure with questions supporting data-based problem solving. Parents will have access to student data electronically and will be kept informed via school newsletter, phone system, and website.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year:

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Nelson Stephenson	Principal
Arah Show	Reading Coach, Reading Department Head
Tod Baldwin	Assistant Principal
Cynthia Barrera	Dean
Dana Holloman	Social Studies Teacher
Lucille LaCava	Media Specialist
Jill Maassen	English Department Head
Mark Pryor	Assistant Principal

How the school-based LLT functions

DHS – The Literacy Leadership Team at DHS is made up of members from many departments. The team meets monthly and develops school wide literacy initiatives including a summer reading list for students, model lessons to be utilized in the classrooms, Instructional Focus Calendars, and adoption of books and novels utilized in the Media Center.

Major initiatives of the LLT

NGCAR-PD trained teachers and trainer will offer training to content area teachers through face-to-face meetings and the district's online learning system.

Reading Coach will meet with content area teachers during common planning to model and facilitate

implementation of content are reading strategies.

Create a literacy culture among the faculty, staff, and students. The team will meet monthly, with members submitting agenda items to the reading coach, who submits the agenda via email to all members one week before the meeting. Members also discuss and review data pertaining to reading trends within the school, to help in areas that are lacking.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Students are encouraged to bring independent reading materials with them to all classes. Teachers were given professional development during pre-school planning, and will continue to learn how to incorporate reading into their content areas throughout the school year, via faculty and departmental professional development activities. Teachers are provided common planning time to develop in-class reading assignments that include strategies that provide for whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning that align to proven reading strategies.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

DeSoto High School offers a full range of Career and Technical programs, Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement courses as well as Honors and regular level courses in every subject area. Visiting speakers tie classroom instruction to needed workplace skills. Field trips are planned to bring students onto major university campuses for exposure to future opportunities. Students are also given opportunities to job shadow and various corporations in and around the community.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

Students are able to meet with academic coaches to discuss course options. Students are required to meet with Guidance Counselors prior to selecting courses for the next year. Coaches, counselors, and students use the student's Academic History and interests to select appropriate courses.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

In an effort to increase reading, writing, and math scores students will have a school-wide cross-curriculum writing assignment including extended and short responses in all classes. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.

Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. Teachers will be provided professional learning

opportunities such as PLC/Data chats, professional development classes, lesson study and/or coaching support

to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies.

Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	49%	34%	No	54%
American Indian		0%		
Asian		50%		
Black/African American	33%	22%	No	39%
Hispanic	44%	28%	No	50%
White	58%	45%	No	62%
English language learners	17%	11%	No	25%
Students with disabilities	33%	15%	No	39%
Economically disadvantaged	44%	29%	No	50%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	153	19%	20%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	113	14%	15%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		50%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		10%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	319	53%	55%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	188	31%	33%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	16	36%	38%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	10	21%	25%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		20%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	300	27%	28%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	123	49%	50%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		45%

Area 3: Mathematics**High School Mathematics****Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	53%		No	58%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	48%		No	53%
Hispanic	54%		No	59%
White	55%		No	60%
English language learners	28%		No	35%
Students with disabilities	24%		No	32%
Economically disadvantaged	52%		No	57%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6		<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>	50%
Students scoring at or above Level 7		<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>	10%

Learning Gains

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)			
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)			

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	173	16%	17%

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	107	35%	37%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	15	5%	7%

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	76	39%	41%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	52	27%	29%

Area 4: Science**High School Science****Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6		<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>	10%
Students scoring at or above Level 7		<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>	10%

Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	118	42%	44%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	66	24%	26%

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)**All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	4		50
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	100	11%	30%

High Schools

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses	45	3%	5%
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses		72%	80%
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	0	0%	0%
CTE-STEM program concentrators	22		24
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	150	13%	16%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		81%	85%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	445	39%	50%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	45	10%	15%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses		85%	88%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	150	33%	40%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		82%	85%
CTE program concentrators	24	20%	22%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	8	100%	100%

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

High School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	30	2%	1%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	86	20%	5%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	125	27%	15%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	266	23%	20%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	103	22%	15%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	435	35%	25%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	345	27%	20%

Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.	36	3%	1%
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	184	77%	80%
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.	9	33%	50%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	221	79%	85%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

DHS would like to increase their parent involvement by providing opportunities for parents to attend school functions. This would include presentations (college board, registration nights, open house, bullying, and other topical presentations)

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase parent involvement on campus	476	41%	50%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Goals Summary

- G1.** Increase all scores on EOC exams by 2%
- G2.** Raise school-wide reading scores.
- G3.** Teacher implementation of effective teaching strategies to promote an environment of rigorous curriculum which is aligned to current standards

Goals Detail

G1. Increase all scores on EOC exams by 2%

Targets Supported

- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- U.S. History EOC
- Science - Biology 1 EOC

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Coaches in Literacy, Math and Science
- PD days and early release PD days
- Common Planning time provided for content area teachers
- Administrative Support
- Good technology infrastructure

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote problem solving as well as critical, independent, and creative thinking

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Weekly grade checks Quarterly Report Card Semester Exams Benchmark Assessments Progress Monitoring

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly

Evidence of Completion:

Increasing school-wide scores on EOCs Increasing school-wide passing rate on EOCs

G2. Raise school-wide reading scores.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Literacy Coach
- PD days and early release days for PD
- Implementation of Cornell Notes for 9th and 10th grade
- Administration Support
- Intensive Reading classes for Level 1 and 2 students
- AVID present in 9th and 10th grade, also being used in 11th and 12th
- Common Planning time for departments
- Administrative support

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of Content Area reading strategies implemented

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Observations of classroom environment

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly

Evidence of Completion:

DeSoto County Schools Teacher Evaluation Instrument Increase of scores on summative exams throughout year Increase of school-wide reading scores

G3. Teacher implementation of effective teaching strategies to promote an environment of rigorous curriculum which is aligned to current standards

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- U.S. History EOC
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- CTE
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Coaches - Literacy, Math, and Science
- Common Core State Standards
- AVID Strategies
- PD days and early release PD half days
- Common Planning for content area teachers
- Administrative Support

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain, and prove reasoning aligned to the standards
- Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent, and creative responses to higher order questions.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Observations of classroom environment

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly

Evidence of Completion:

DeSoto County Schools Teacher Evaluation Instrument Increase of scores on summative exams throughout year

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Increase all scores on EOC exams by 2%

G1.B2 Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote problem solving as well as critical, independent, and creative thinking

G1.B2.S2 Teachers will plan for an include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS and CCSS

Action Step 1

Administration monitoring through lesson plans, walk throughs and observations Coaches provide school wide PD on Questioning techniques for use in classroom Coaches model questioning strategies in classrooms Teacher use of Costa's Levels of Questioning in classroom instruction and student created work Teacher use of content specific Higher Level Questioning Stems during classroom

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Meetings/PLC Meetings PD days Collaborative Lesson Planning

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans Observations Student Scores Increasing

Facilitator:

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants:

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Action Step 2

Administration monitoring through lesson plans, walk throughs and observations Coaches provide school wide PD on Questioning techniques for use in classroom Coaches model questioning strategies in classrooms Teacher use of Costa's Levels of Questioning in classroom instruction and student created work Teacher use of content specific Higher Level Questioning Stems during classroom

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Meetings/PLC Meetings PD days Collaborative Lesson Planning

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans Observations Student Scores Increasing

Facilitator:

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants:

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S2

Checking Lesson Plans Walk throughs for observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Student work samples Student interviews for knowledge of use of questioning stems Scores on Benchmark and Progress Monitoring Assessments throughout the year

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S2

Student work samples Student interviews Assessment results Data from Benchmarks

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson planning meetings and PLC meetings Student Assessments Teacher Observations Coaches coteaching lessons in content areas

Evidence of Completion

Increased scores on Benchmark assessments and summatives throughout the year Increased scores school-wide on EOC exams Increased passing rate school-wide on EOC exams

G2. Raise school-wide reading scores.

G2.B1 Lack of Content Area reading strategies implemented

G2.B1.S3 Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.

Action Step 1

Modeling in classroom PD for cooperative strategies Student discussions in class on topics presented by teachers

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly lesson plans Common lesson planning for content areas PD Modeling in classroom

Evidence of Completion

Elevation of scores throughout school and year Student interviews Demonstration of a collaborative classroom

Facilitator:

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants:

Teachers and Coaches

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S3

Walk throughs of classrooms Lesson Plans Common Planning meetings - Discussions

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Elevation of scores throughout school and year Student interviews Demonstration of a collaborative classroom

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S3

Student interviews Classroom observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Coaching

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Observations Lesson Plans Coaches coteaching lessons in content area

Evidence of Completion

Use of cooperative structures and strategies in the classroom Increase in scores on assessments throughout year

G3. Teacher implementation of effective teaching strategies to promote an environment of rigorous curriculum which is aligned to current standards

G3.B10 Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain, and prove reasoning aligned to the standards

G3.B10.S1 Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.

Action Step 1

Modeling in classroom PD for cooperative strategies Student discussions in class on topics presented by teachers

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly lesson plans Common lesson planning for content areas PD Modeling in classroom

Evidence of Completion

Elevation of scores throughout school and year Student interviews Demonstration of a collaborative classroom

Facilitator:

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants:

Teachers and Coaches

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B10.S1

Walk throughs of classrooms Lesson Plans Common Planning meetings - Discussions

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Elevation of scores throughout school and year Student interviews Demonstration of a collaborative classroom

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B10.S1

Student interviews Classroom observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Coaching

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Observations Lesson Plans Coaches coteaching lessons in content area

Evidence of Completion

Use of cooperative structures and strategies in the classroom Increase in scores on assessments throughout year DeSoto County Schools Teacher Evaluation Instrument

G3.B11 Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent, and creative responses to higher order questions.

G3.B11.S2 Teachers will plan for an include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS and CCSS

Action Step 1

Administration monitoring through lesson plans, walk throughs and observations Coaches provide school wide PD on Questioning techniques for use in classroom Coaches model questioning strategies in classrooms Teacher use of Costa's Levels of Questioning in classroom instruction and student created work Teacher use of content specific Higher Level Questioning Stems during classroom

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Meetings/PLC Meetings PD days Collaborative Lesson Planning

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans Observations Student Scores Increasing

Action Step 2

Administration monitoring through lesson plans, walk throughs and observations Coaches provide school wide PD on Questioning techniques for use in classroom Coaches model questioning strategies in classrooms Teacher use of Costa's Levels of Questioning in classroom instruction and student created work Teacher use of content specific Higher Level Questioning Stems during classroom

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Meetings/PLC Meetings PD days Collaborative Lesson Planning

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans Observations Student Scores Increasing

Facilitator:

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants:

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B11.S2

Checking lesson plans Walk throughs Observations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Student work samples Student interviews for knowledge of use of questioning stems Scores on Benchmark and Progress Monitoring Assessments throughout the year

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B11.S2

Student work samples Student interviews Assessment results Data from Benchmarks

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson planning meetings and PLC meetings Student Assessments Teacher Observations
Coaches coteaching lessons in content areas

Evidence of Completion

Increased scores on Benchmark assessments and summatives throughout the year Increased scores
school-wide on EOC exams Increased passing rate school-wide on EOC exams

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title II, Part A funds are used to provide supplemental professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators at all school sites in the district. Specific activities are based on the needs of the schools, as determined by student performance data and surveys of all stakeholders. These funds are used in collaboration with funds from local sources and other Federal projects.

Title II Part D funds are used to support instructional technology through the purchase and repair of hardware, purchase of software, and provision of professional development in the use of technology as an instructional tool.

Title III

Services are provided at each school site to support education of English Language Learners for the purpose of improving student performance.

Title X- Homeless The coordinator of district services for Homeless students provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are coordinated with funds from other sources, including Title I, to provide summer institute instruction and supplemental and/or intervention instruction during the academic year to support students in need of academic assistance.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence/anti-bullying program and anti-drug program to all students as part of the Character Education program for the site. This may include, but not be limited to, guest speakers, field trips, and community service activities such as Big Brother/Big Sisters.

Nutrition Program

Students are provided a free breakfast and free lunch at 100% no cost.

CTE

Certification exams for students are paid in full by the district.

Carl D Perkins funds are used to provide support to students as they make career decisions at the middle and high schools.

Career and vocational programs at the secondary levels, including dual enrollment vocational programs, are provided for regular, disadvantaged, and handicapped students.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Increase all scores on EOC exams by 2%

G1.B2 Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote problem solving as well as critical, independent, and creative thinking

G1.B2.S2 Teachers will plan for an include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS and CCSS

PD Opportunity 1

Administration monitoring through lesson plans, walk throughs and observations Coaches provide school wide PD on Questioning techniques for use in classroom Coaches model questioning strategies in classrooms Teacher use of Costa's Levels of Questioning in classroom instruction and student created work Teacher use of content specific Higher Level Questioning Stems during classroom

Facilitator

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Meetings/PLC Meetings PD days Collaborative Lesson Planning

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans Observations Student Scores Increasing

PD Opportunity 2

Administration monitoring through lesson plans, walk throughs and observations Coaches provide school wide PD on Questioning techniques for use in classroom Coaches model questioning strategies in classrooms Teacher use of Costa's Levels of Questioning in classroom instruction and student created work Teacher use of content specific Higher Level Questioning Stems during classroom

Facilitator

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Meetings/PLC Meetings PD days Collaborative Lesson Planning

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans Observations Student Scores Increasing

G2. Raise school-wide reading scores.

G2.B1 Lack of Content Area reading strategies implemented

G2.B1.S3 Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.

PD Opportunity 1

Modeling in classroom PD for cooperative strategies Student discussions in class on topics presented by teachers

Facilitator

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants

Teachers and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly lesson plans Common lesson planning for content areas PD Modeling in classroom

Evidence of Completion

Elevation of scores throughout school and year Student interviews Demonstration of a collaborative classroom

G3. Teacher implementation of effective teaching strategies to promote an environment of rigorous curriculum which is aligned to current standards

G3.B10 Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain, and prove reasoning aligned to the standards

G3.B10.S1 Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.

PD Opportunity 1

Modeling in classroom PD for cooperative strategies Student discussions in class on topics presented by teachers

Facilitator

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants

Teachers and Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly lesson plans Common lesson planning for content areas PD Modeling in classroom

Evidence of Completion

Elevation of scores throughout school and year Student interviews Demonstration of a collaborative classroom

G3.B11 Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent, and creative responses to higher order questions.

G3.B11.S2 Teachers will plan for an include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS and CCSS

PD Opportunity 1

Administration monitoring through lesson plans, walk throughs and observations Coaches provide school wide PD on Questioning techniques for use in classroom Coaches model questioning strategies in classrooms Teacher use of Costa's Levels of Questioning in classroom instruction and student created work Teacher use of content specific Higher Level Questioning Stems during classroom

Facilitator

Coaches - Literacy, Math and Science

Participants

Teachers , Coaches, and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Common Lesson Planning Meetings/PLC Meetings PD days Collaborative Lesson Planning

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans Observations Student Scores Increasing

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals