

Cover Sheet for Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for Alternative Education Campuses for 2010-11

Organization Code: 8001 District Name: CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE School Code: 3475 School Name: GOAL ACADEMY

Section I: Summary Information about the School

Student Performance Measures for State and ESEA Accountability

AEC Performance Indicators	AEC Measures/ Metrics (Selected Sept. 1 st 20xx)	'09-10 Federal and State Expectations			'09-10 School Results		Meets AEC Expectations?	
		Reading	1-year	3-years	1-year	3-years		
Academic Achievement (Status)	CSAP, CSAPA, Lectura, Escritura Description: % P+A in reading, writing, math and science Expectation: %P+A is above the 50 th percentile by using 1-year or 3-years of data Other measures selected by AEC	Reading	73.3%	72.2%	42.4%	47.4%	Meets	
		Math	33.5%	30.5%	8.5%	7.1%	Meets	
		Writing	50.0%	49.6%	17.9%	21.8%	Meets	
		Science	50.0%	50.0%	11.1%	15.8%	Meets	
	Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Description: % PP+P+A on CSAP, CSAPA and Lectura in Reading and Math for each group Expectation: Targets set by state*	Overall number of targets for School: 14			% of targets met by School: 71.4%		Reading	YES
Academic Growth	Median Student Growth Percentile Description: CSAP Growth in reading, writing, math Expectation: If school met adequate growth, then median SGP is at or above 45 If school did not meet adequate growth, then median SGP is at or above 55 Other measures selected by AEC		Median Adequate SGP	Median SGP				
		Reading	47	45/55	Median SGP: 37		Meets	
		Math	99	45/55	Median SGP: 28		Approaching	
		Writing	85	45/55	Median SGP: 31		Approaching	

Student Performance Measures for State and ESEA Accountability (cont.)

Performance Indicators	Measures/ Metrics	'09-10 Federal and State Expectations		'09-10 School Results		Meets AEC Expectations?
Post Secondary Readiness	Graduation Rate Expectation: 80% or above	80% or above		46.5%		Exceeds
	Dropout Rate Expectation: At or below State average	1-year	3-years	1-year	3-years	Meets
		5.09%	5.74%	15.4%	15.4%	
	Mean ACT Composite Score Expectation: At or above State average	1-year	3-years	1-year	3-years	Meets
		19	20	16	15.8	
Other measures selected by AEC						
Student Engagement	Measure selected by AEC	Percent of students who were enrolled in GOAL May 2009 and were included in the October 1, 2009 October count (excluding graduating seniors).		45.4%		Approaching

Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan

Program	Identification Process	Identification for School	Directions for completing improvement plan
State Accountability			
Recommended Plan Type	Plan assigned based on school's overall school performance framework score (achievement, growth, growth gaps, postsecondary and workforce readiness)	Improvement	Due to this AEC transition year, all Alternative Educational Campuses (AEC) have been assigned a default improvement plan by Colorado Department of Education (CDE). Colorado Charter School Institute (CSI) has approved the default assignment
ESEA Accountability			
School Improvement or Corrective Action (Title I)	Title I school missed same AYP target(s) for at least two consecutive years**	N/A	Not identified for improvement under Title 1.

Section II: Improvement Plan Information

Additional Information about the School

Comprehensive Review and Selected Grant History		
Related Grant Awards	Did the school receive a Tiered Intervention grant? Indicate the intervention approach.	<input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround <input type="checkbox"/> Restart <input type="checkbox"/> Transformation <input type="checkbox"/> Closure
	Has the school received a School Improvement grant? When was the grant awarded?	No Grant has been awarded.
School Support Team or Expedited Review	Has (or will) the school participated in an SST review or Expedited Review? When?	Yes (CSSI). February 28-March 4, 2011.
External Evaluator	Has the school partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used.	No.

Improvement Plan Information

The school is submitting this improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (check all that apply):

- State Accountability
 Title IA
 Tiered Intervention Grant
 School Improvement Grant
 Other: _____

School Contact Information (Additional contacts may be added, if needed)		
1	Name and Title	Ken Crowell
	Email	Kd.crowell@goalac.org
	Phone	1-719-671-0438
	Mailing Address	3621 W. 73 rd Ave Unit C&D Westminster, CO 80030
2	Name and Title	Kris Enright
	Email	k.enright@goalac.org
	Phone	1-719-242-3890
	Mailing Address	3621 W. 73 rd Ave Unit C&D Westminster, CO 80030

Section III: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification

Data Analysis Worksheet

AEC Performance Indicators	Description of Significant Trends (3 years of past data)	Priority Needs	Root Causes
	<p>GOAL Academy is entering its third year of operation and has only two years of CSAP data (2009 and 2010). Due to the turbulence resulting from its separation from the Cesar Chavez Network during the 2009-10 school year, as well as changes in assessments utilized, CSI has allowed GOAL to write several sections of the UIP as if this were its initial year.</p>		<p>Statistical trends within CSAP were examined; however, because the school was only in its second year of operation and the turbulent change of leadership that occurred within its second year, Root Cause Analysis identified operational issues rather than curricular issues as GOAL's obstacles to academic success. Therefore, all of the strategies identified in the UIP's Improvement Strategies will focus on building and strengthening GOAL's foundation.</p>
<p>Academic Achievement (Status)</p>	<p><u>AEC comparison data:</u> Math 2010 AEC: 9.8% GOAL: 9% Rating: "Meets" Reading 2010 AEC: 31.5% GOAL: 42% Rating: "Meets" Writing 2010 AEC: 13.61% GOAL: 19% Rating: "Meets" Science: 2010 AEC: 14.06% GOAL: 11.1% Rating: "Meets"</p>		<p>There was limited oversight of student progress and course completion rates during the 2009-10 school year due to substantial change over of school board and removal of EMO.</p> <p>GOAL did not have a "wet lab" nor did it place sufficient emphasis on Science. Most students enrolling in GOAL Academy were struggling readers, causing teachers to place their teaching emphasis on reading in order to bring their students closer to grade appropriate reading levels prior to adding the necessary Science work.</p>

	<p><u>CSI and GOAL Selected Measures of Accountability:</u></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p><u>AEC targets and cutpoints:</u> "Exceeds"= 15 percentage points or more above the state AEC student average. "Meets"= AEC student average, plus or minus 9 percentage points. "Approaching"= 10-20 percentage points below the state AEC student average. "Does Not Meet"= More than 20 percentage points below the state AEC student average.</p> </div> <p>Math: GOAL obtained a "meets" score. Writing: GOAL obtained a "meets" score. Reading: GOAL obtained a "meets" score. Science: GOAL obtained a "meets" score.</p> <hr/> <p><u>CSAP Status (compared to State):</u> Math 2009: 2% (N=88) 2010: 9% (N=123) Reading 2009: 50% 2010: 42% Writing 2009: 22% 2010: 19% Science 2009: 25% (N=51) 2010: 13%(N=83)</p>	<p>GOAL and CSI will agree on a new Performance Contract in the Spring of 2011.</p> <hr/> <p>There was no consistent board or staff leadership, clear direction or school improvement plan during the 2009-10 school year.</p> <p>Due to limited capacity in leadership, staff expectations and job descriptions were not well defined. As a result, staff did not adequately monitor student academic progress or course completion.</p> <p>GOAL Academy inaccurately placed students into courses</p>
--	---	---

MATH:

CSAP status scores increased in Math from 2% (2009) to 9% P and A (2010). Gender gaps were identified (female P and A%: 3, male P and A%: 17). GOAL will monitor 2011 math data with interim assessments and responsive curricular adjustments to address any identified gap(s).

WRITING:

CSAP Writing scores have remained stable over time 22% (2009) and 19% (2010) P and A. A trend regarding the declining scores within the Hispanic student population from 2009 to 2010 was noted. GOAL will monitor 2011 writing data with interim assessments and responsive curricular adjustments to address any identified gap(s).

READING:

CSAP status scores declined in Reading from 50% to 42% P and A. Due to the increase in the number of students at GOAL this change is not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

A concern was identified within the Hispanic population as the percent of students scoring Unsatisfactory increased from 12% (2009 N=52) to 22% (2010 N=58). However, of the 2010 N=58 Hispanic students, fewer than 16 were returning students. GOAL will continue to track the growth of both new and returning ethnic students.

SCIENCE

(either below or above ability) and there was little verification or monitoring of student's progress during 2009-10 school year.

Gender and ethnic gaps were identified. However, because of the small N size, caution is being used in interpretation of those gaps. Future analysis will determine whether the trends seen here are significant, and whether they are school-wide or within geographic locations (i.e. Pueblo vs. Denver metro area).

GOAL Academy: CSAP Proficiency Over Time by Gender												
	Reading				Writing				Math			
	2009		2010		2009		2010		2009		2010	
	N	P/A%	N	P/A%	N	P/A%	N	P/A%	N	P/A%	N	P/A%
Female	27	66.7	59	47.5	27	44.4	59	16.9	27	3.7	59	1.7
Male	23	47.8	47	36.2	23	13.0	47	19.1	22	4.5	47	17
Total	50	58.0	106	42.5	50	30.0	106	17.9	49	4.1	106	8.5

	<p>CSAP Science scores declined from 25% (2009) to 13% (2010) P and A. A trend regarding the declining scores within the Hispanic student population from 2009 to 2010 was noted. GOAL will monitor the 2011 Science data with formative assessments and responsive curricular adjustments to address any identified gap(s).</p> <p><u>NWEA : Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)</u></p> <p>The MAP was administered to 270 students in the fall of 2009.</p> <p>Math</p> <p>GOAL's average 9th grade Math RIT score was 222 while the National average is 232.</p> <p>GOAL's average 10th grade Math RIT score was 227 while the National average was 235.</p> <p>GOAL's average 11th grade Math RIT score was 227 while the National average was 237.</p> <p>GOAL's average 12th grade Math RIT score was 228. There is no National average.</p> <p>Reading</p> <p>GOAL's average 9th grade Reading RIT score was 213 while the National average was 221.</p> <p>GOAL's average 10th grade Reading RIT score was 218 while the National average was 224.</p> <p>GOAL's average 11th grade Reading RIT score was 218 while the National average was 225.</p> <p>GOAL's average 12th grade Reading RIT score was 217. There is no national average.</p>	<p>The Spring MAP assessments were not consistently administered. As a result, there are limited fall/spring growth data available.</p>	<p>A total of 270 students took the fall 2009 Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments. Rasch Unit (RIT) scores in Math, Language Arts, and Reading were all below CSI and National grade levels for non-AEC schools.</p> <p>Spring MAP were not consistently administered, due to the contract change between CCSN, CSI, GOAL, and NWEA. The fall 2009 data technically belongs to CCSN, however, CSI uploaded it into Alpine and the data are available for GOAL use.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Language Usage</p> <p>GOAL's average 9th grade Language Usage RIT score was 209 while the National average was 219.</p> <p>GOAL's average 10th grade Language Usage RIT score was 222 while the National average was 232.</p> <p>Language Usage assessments were not administered for 11th and 12th graders.</p> <p>Ethnicity identifiers were not placed in Alpine's NWEA files, therefore, a closer examination of Fall baseline scores is not possible.</p>	
<p>Academic Growth</p>	<p><u>CSI and GOAL Selected Measures of Accountability:</u></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><u>AEC targets and cutpoints:</u></p> <p>"Exceeds"= At or above the 45th percentile.</p> <p>"Meets"= At or above the 35th , but below the 45th percentile</p> <p>"Approaching"= At or above the 25th , but below the 35th percentile</p> <p>"Does Not Meet"= Below the 25th percentile.</p> </div> <p><u>Reading 2010:</u> MPG= 37. GOAL received a rating of "Meets."</p> <p>49% made "low growth", 21% made "typical growth," and 30% made "high growth."</p> <p><u>Writing 2010:</u> MGP=31. GOAL received a rating of "Approaching."</p>	<p>There was no consistent board or staff leadership, clear direction or school improvement plan during the 2009-10 school year.</p> <p>Due to limited leadership capacity, staff expectations and job descriptions were not well defined. As a result staff did not adequately monitor student academic progress or course completion.</p> <p>GOAL Academy inaccurately placed some students into courses (either below or above their ability) and there was little verification or monitoring of student's progress.</p> <p>No alternative assessment supporting growth was in place during the 2009-10 school year.</p>



	<p>53% made "low growth, 33% made "typical growth," and 14% made "high growth."</p> <p><u>Math 2010:</u> MGP= 28. GOAL received a rating of "Approaching."</p> <p>61% made "low growth", 25% made "typical growth," and 14% made "high growth."</p> <p>The lowest growth trends were made at the 10th grade level.</p> <p><u>Longitudinal cohort :</u> Of the 106 students who took the 2010 CSAP 13.2% were returning students (N=14). Due to privacy issues and small N size, analysis of these cannot be discussed.</p> <p><u>2009 and 2010 cohorts</u> The district identified a concern within the Hispanic population and the percentage of students rated Unsatisfactory. Within Reading, this percentage increased from 12% to 22% (N=52 vs.58). Within Writing, the percent of students Hispanic students scoring Unsatisfactory increased from 12% to 24% and in Math the percentage increased from 71% to 84%.</p>	<p>Possible patterns developing</p>	
	<p><u>2007-10:</u> GOAL has been assigned by its authorizer, status as a year 1 school. There is no three-year trend data available.</p>		

<p>Post Secondary Readiness (Graduation Rate)</p>	<p>AEC average: 30.95% GOAL score: 46.5%</p> <p>GOAL's graduation rate places the school within the "Exceeds" classification as per the temporary agreement between GOAL and CSI that is rooted in the current state AEC average. Final agreement on statewide AEC graduation standards are currently being developed by the Department.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Student Engagement Continuous Enrollment: Percent of students who were enrolled in May 2009 and were included in the October 1 2009 count (excluding graduating seniors)</p>	<p>May 2009-Oct 1 2009: 45.4%</p>		<p>It was not a priority within the CCSN to recruit or retain students within GOAL.</p>

Preuss, P. G. (2003). *School Leader's Guide to Root Cause Analysis: Using Data to Dissolve Problems*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education

Step 4: Create the Data Narrative

Data Narrative for School

<p>Trend Analysis and Priority Needs: On which performance indicators is our school trending positively? On which performance indicators is our school trending negatively? Does this differ for any disaggregated student groups, e.g., by grade level or gender? What performance challenges are the highest priorities for our school?</p>		<p>Root Cause Analysis: Why do we think our school's performance is what it is?</p>		<p>Verification of Root Cause: What evidence do you have for your conclusions?</p>
--	---	--	---	---

GOAL Academy charter school is an online Alternative Educational Campus (AEC) with more than 95% of students qualifying as at-risk. During the fall of 2009, in response to CSI's request for access to CCSN financial records and an independent GOAL Board, and following months of disputes between the Cesar Chavez School Network (CCSN) and the Colorado Charter School Institute (CSI), CCSN staff terminated GOAL's senior leadership and staff, locking down all GOAL student and staff access to curricula. CCSN staff took over GOAL sites, records, and operations, demanding that remaining GOAL staff sign loyalty letters. Following weeks of political and legal discussions, CCSN's CEO and other CCSN staff were terminated, GOAL staff members were reinstated, and an independent GOAL Board was established. Although a nine-person independent GOAL Board was established, four of the Board members appeared to remain loyal to CCSN and worked to obstruct efforts towards independence, repeatedly challenging the legitimacy of the Board, and consequently, attempting to block many Board actions.

During the 2009 -2010 school year, GOAL Academy's administration primarily focused on establishing independent business operations (e.g., bank accounts, insurance, new contracts and leases) while recovering records lost during the CCSN takeover. During the same time frame, GOAL's legal counsel and CSI worked with the state of Colorado's fiscal and legal agents to recover GOAL funds from CSSN, establish a clear separation from CSSN, and operate the school. By June 2010, GOAL had legally separated from CCSN, had recovered records and funds from CSSN, and was fiscally and organizationally able to operate and plan independently. Thus, in many ways, GOAL's real initial year is 2010 – 2011.

The October 1, 2009 count reported a total of 609 students; 47 were 9th graders and 99 were 10th graders. Less than 24% of GOAL's student's were captured within the CSAP results. Only 14 students were part of GOAL's longitudinal cohort (students who took CSAP with GOAL in 2009 and again in 2010) making any year-to-year growth examination statistically unsound. Looking at the growth data, there were a total of 106 students who took the 2010 CSAP. Of those 106 students, 85.8% were new to GOAL that year. 48% (N=51) of those 106 tested students had no historical CSAP data within the past two years. GOAL's enrollment documents identify these students as having either dropped out of schools or been homeschooled prior to enrolling at GOAL.

The majority of GOAL's student population has been unsuccessful in previous academic environments and performs below grade level. 2010 BASI scores indicate that on an average:

- 9th grade students entered GOAL 3.5 years behind in math, 2.3 years behind in language comprehension and 2 years behind in verbal reading comprehension.

- 10th grade students entered GOAL 3.8 years behind in math, 2.7 years behind in language comprehension and 2.5 years behind in verbal reading comprehension.
- 11th grade students entered GOAL 4.4 years behind in math, 3.1 years behind in language comprehension and 3.2 years behind in verbal reading comprehension.
- 12th grade students entered GOAL 5.5 years behind in math, 4.4 years behind in language comprehension and 4.3 years behind in verbal reading comprehension.

While an alternative assessment (Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)) was administered in the fall of 2009, it was not administered in the spring due to the fact that NWEA (owners of MAP) signed the contract with CCSN and not GOAL. Due to the lack of interim testing, student progress could not be monitored throughout the year and immediate data-driven instruction could not be implemented. In addition, GOAL struggled with its server and MAP: students had difficulty logging into the server due to NWEA's inability to operate in a non-centralized system. Quite often, students would be mid-way through their fall administration and the server would log them out. When students logged back in, they would have to start the assessment from the beginning. This became frustrating for both the students and the staff.

In an effort to address CSI's request for triangulation of data, GOAL implemented the BASI in the fall of 2010 and will do so again in the spring of 2011. Fall to spring growth measures will be examined and presented to the Board and Institute.

GOAL has been collaboratively working with CDE, the other online schools and Alternative Educational Centers to research alternative assessments fitting the needs that are specific to GOAL. In the Spring of 2011 GOAL administered a survey to other online schools regarding the alternative assessments (i.e. assessment other than CSAP) they currently use or have used in the past and the benefits and challenges of the assessment. Based on the 13 online schools that responded (60% response rate) 54.5% of the schools currently use MAP. However, most of these are required to use MAP as part of their district contract and the server is housed within the centralized district.

Technological challenges: Over the past two years GOAL has researched and struggled to find a student information system that will address its unique online, competency based open entry open exit, needs. GOAL is working with other online and competency based schools, both within Colorado and nationally, to research and implement what works within these schools.

Because of the challenges GOAL faced during the 2009-10 academic year, CSI has designated GOAL as a year 1 school with respect to academic targets and improvement strategies. As a result, the data contained in this report will be evaluated as baseline data. Statistical analysis on available data was conducted, however, based on small longitudinal N size and number of dropout recovery students, caution was used when evaluating the 2010 CSAP data.

DATA:

Below are the AEC comparison and CSI metrics results:

Student Achievement Data (Status):

Math 2010 AEC: 9.8% GOAL: 9%.

Reading 2010 AEC:31.5% GOAL: 42%.

Writing 2010 AEC: 13.61% GOAL: 19%.

Science: 2010 AEC: 14.06% GOAL: 11.1%.

GOAL received a "Meets" category rating on all of the CSAP status subject areas.

Student Longitudinal Growth:

Reading 2010: MPG= 37. GOAL received a rating of "Meets."

Writing 2010: MGP=31. GOAL received a rating of "Approaching."

Math 2010: MGP= 28. GOAL received a rating of "Approaching."

Postsecondary Workforce Readiness:

Student graduation rate was 46.5%. GOAL received a rating of "Exceeds."

Student Engagement:

Student engagement was 45.4%. GOAL received a rating of "Approaching."

Priority Needs and Root Cause Analysis:

Because of the limited body of data, a comprehensive growth analysis could not be conducted. An additional struggle lay in the fact that 85.8% of the student population was new to GOAL in Oct 2009 so looking for trends in 2009 to 2010 status data was difficult as well. With that said, data analysis still suggested that GOAL was meeting AEC expectations, but still had room for improvement. Root Cause Analysis conducted between December and March of 2010-2011 identified three problems: lack of consistent leadership, poor staff expectations and poor monitoring of student academic progress and course completion.

As explained above, in 2009-10 there was no consistent board or staff leadership, and for some time it was unclear to all, including the authorizer, who was in charge of the school. During qualitative interviews conducted during August 2010 staff acknowledged that they were unclear about their job and duties and students were not being properly monitored. Systems and programs were simply not in place and there was no clear direction from CCSN that student achievement was a priority. Many staff members reported that they felt more like social workers rather than HQ teachers. – thus the need to reevaluate the role of a teacher in this environment.

Next Steps:

Since GOAL's separation from CCSN, the school has focused on building its policies and guidelines, staff, student population, and culture. In the fall of 2010, an executive team was hired and it has begun to craft the policies and guidelines that are essential to GOAL's success. The team has adopted the Baldrige Model approach to this process. Baldrige is a public-private partnership dedicated to performance excellence. Its mission is to improve competitiveness and performance of US organizations, for the benefit of all U.S residents. It:

- develops and disseminates evaluation criteria;
- promotes performance excellence;
- provides global leadership in learning and sharing successful strategies and performance practices, principles and methodologies.

Results from a 1995 Baldrige pilot program indicated that education organizations were very similar to other service organizations. Thus, Baldrige created *Education Criteria for Performance Excellence* (AKA: *Baldrige Education Criteria*).

The requirements of the *Baldrige Education Criteria* are embodied in seven categories:

1. Leadership
2. Strategic Planning
3. Customer focus (students and parents)
4. Measurement, analysis and knowledge management
5. Workforce focus
6. Process management
7. Results

Additional information of Baldrige's Education Criteria can be found at: <http://www.nist.gov/baldrige/enter/education.cfm>

In the Fall of 2010, several key GOAL staff members attended trainings on Baldrige and other school improvement strategies. Since that training,

the first two of the required eight steps have been completed. GOAL's *Strategic Improvement Plan* will incorporate CDE's Charter School Support Team (CSST), (following their site visit which was conducted in March 2011). The *Strategic Improvement Plan*, will be finalized and approved by the GOAL Board by June 30, 2011, after which it will be available on the GOAL website.

Section IV: Action Plan(s)

School Goals Worksheet (cont.)

AEC Performance Indicators	AEC Measures/Metrics	Annual Targets		Interim Measures for 2010-11	Major Improvement Strategies	
		2010-11	2011-12			
Academic Achievement (Status)		R	Increase the percentage of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and continue to meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.	Increase the percent of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and continue to meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.	Alternative Assessment (administered a minimum of 2 times per year). The specific alternative assessment will be determined by July 1, 2011 with the guidance of CSI, other AEC's and GOAL Board.	Implementation of Students Admissions Plan to help ensure that accurate transcripts and records are available for accurate student grade level and course placement. And process to notify CSI quickly when records are being withheld from a student's past school. Accurate placement of students into correct course work levels will increase completion rates and ensure that students are beginning to work at their current
		M	Increase the percentage of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.	Increase the percent of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.		
		W	Increase the percentage of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and continue to meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.	Increase the percent of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and continue to meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.		
		S	Increase the percentage of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.	Increase the percent of students who score proficient or advanced by 2% and meet the AEC expectations for this academic area.		

					<p>level and building basic foundation for advancement.</p> <p>Cohesive implementation of MYGOAL and Students Advocacy Program.</p> <p>Area Directors will work with Office of Innovation to ensure that all TS3 teams are monitoring student progress and work completion on a weekly basis.</p> <p>All students will be assessed with an alternative assessment (e.g. MAP, Scantron or BASI) three times a year to track growth.</p>
	<p>AYP (Overall and for each disaggregated groups)</p>	R	<p>Our goal is to make Safe Harbor in order to make AYP. Our goals will also be for each disaggregated group to make Safe Harbor (a 10% reduction in Unsatisfactory scores).</p>	<p>Our goal will be to make Safe Harbor in order to make AYP. Our goals will also be for each disaggregated group to make Safe Harbor (a 10% reduction in Unsatisfactory scores).</p>	<p>Same as above.</p>

		M	Continue to meet AYP	Continue to meet AYP		
Academic Growth		R	Continue to receive a "Meets" rating on the SGP for the AEC expectations.	Continue to receive a "Meets" rating on the SGP for the AEC expectations.	Same as above.	Same as above.
		M	Increase the Median SGP to receive a "Meets" rating for AEC expectations in the next 2 years.	Increase the Median SGP to receive a "Meets" rating for AEC expectations in the next 2 years.		
		W	Increase the Median SGP to receive a "Meets" rating for AEC expectations in the next 2 years.	Increase the Median SGP to receive a "Meets" rating for AEC expectations in the next 2 years.		
Post Secondary Readiness	Graduation Rate		Continue to "Meet" or "Exceed" graduation rates for AEC.	Continue to "Meet" or "Exceed" graduation rates for AEC.	NA	NA
Student Engagement	Continuous Enrollment: Percent of students from the 09-10 school year that returned in the 10-11 school year.		Increase the continuous enrollment rate by 5% in order to reach "Meets" for the AEC expectations in the next 2 years.	Increase the continuous enrollment rate by 5% in order to reach "Meets" for the AEC expectations by the end of this year.	Student satisfaction surveys will be administered at both midyear and end of year.	Ensuring clear student expectations and providing students with additional supports, plus student advocacy should truancy become an issue.

Action Planning Worksheet

Major Improvement Strategy #1: Senior leadership will consistently deploy GOAL’s vision and values throughout the organization.

Root Cause(s) Addressed: There was limited leadership capacity and no consistent board or staff leadership, clear direction or school improvement plan during the 2009-10 school year.

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

- School Plan under State Accountability
 Title IA School Improvement/Corrective Action Plan
 Application for a Tiered Intervention Grant
 Title I schoolwide or targeted assistance plan requirements
 School Improvement Grant

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks
Approval of revised Mission and Vision	February 2011	Administration		Completed in January 2011.
Development of school Strategic Improvement Plan. Steps include the following:				
1. Finalize members of Strategic Planning Team (STP). This team currently consists of 8 members.	November, 2010	Senior Leadership	State funds will be used to provide professional development to training the senior leadership group (8 people) and to provide continuing monthly attendance at Colorado ASQ meetings. Approximate cost \$1800 per person for 8 attendees at National ASQ meetings Approximate cost for monthly Colorado ASQ meetings for 2 to three people \$1500 per annum.	Team members were selected in November 2010.
2. ASQ Leadership survey and results support the development of the school's Strategic Improvement Plan.	July 1, 2011	Senior Leadership	In house staff will conduct action step.	<i>Baldrige Leadership Survey</i> was completed in January 2011. The STP reviewed results in February

				<p>and the Team has begun to develop GOAL's <i>Strategic Improvement Plan</i>.</p> <p>April 2011: Results of the CSSI report will be incorporated into <i>Strategic Improvement Plan's draft</i>.</p> <p>July 2011: Final <i>Strategic Improvement Plan</i> will be presented to all GOAL staff. Presentation and implementation of <i>Strategic Improvement Plan</i> is discussed in Strategy #4 below.</p>
<p>3. Staff "Environmental Scan" (survey) and results will support the development of the school's Strategic Improvement Plan.</p>	<p>July 1, 2011</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>February 2011: Staff <i>Environmental Scan</i> completed and STP reviewed results.</p> <p>March 2011: Parent, Student and Community <i>Environmental Scan Survey</i> will be released.</p> <p>April 2011: Results of Staff, Student, Parent and Community <i>Environmental Scan</i> will be incorporated into <i>Strategic Improvement Plan</i>.</p> <p>July 2011: Final Strategic Improvement Plan will be presented to staff</p> <p>Weekly Senior Level Meetings ("Cabinet") minutes will document progress.</p>
<p>4. Incorporate CSSI site visit results into strategic plan.</p>	<p>April, 2011</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>March 2011: presentation of CSSI report.</p>
<p>5. Hire Lean Six Sigma or other qualified consultants (CLCS) to assist GOAL in implementing the <i>Strategic Improvement</i></p>	<p>April 2011- June, 2012</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>Estimate \$1500 on a monthly basis to provide for travel and other items to</p>	<p>March 2011: research on Lean Six Sigma</p>

<p><i>Plan.</i></p>			<p>support a state wide meeting. \$18,000 annually</p>	<p>May 2011: Online Lean training trainings will be 50% completed. Summer 2011: Consultant to assist Senior Leadership with Lean Six Sigma trainings. Weekly Cabinet minutes will document progress.</p>
<p>6. Implement Strategic Improvement Plan using ASQ/Baldrige methodology. Individual TS3 meetings will be conducted throughout the school.</p>	<p>July, 2011- July 2012.</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>Federal Startup funds \$10,000 to provide outside leadership in order to conduct a Strategic planning session with Board and staff.</p>	<p>Weekly Cabinet minutes will document progress. <i>Strategic Improvement Plan</i> will provide greater detail on the plan and its implementation.</p>

* Not required for state or federal requirements. Completion of the "Key Personnel" column is optional for schools.

Major Improvement Strategy #2: Development of job descriptions and staff expectations.

Root Cause(s) Addressed: Staff expectations and job descriptions were not well defined and as a result there was limited monitoring of student academic progress or course completion.

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

- School Plan under State Accountability
 Title IA School Improvement/Corrective Action Plan
 Application for a Tiered Intervention Grant
 Title I schoolwide or targeted assistance plan requirements
 School Improvement Grant

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks
The job descriptions will be developed. Key site staff will be enlisted to help evaluate.	April 15, 2011	Human Resources	In house staff will conduct action step.	Descriptions will be reviewed and finalized by senior leadership.
The descriptions will be posted on GOAL staff portal.	April 20, 2011	Human Resources	In house staff will conduct action step.	Descriptions will be sent to technology department for upload in late March.
Staff expectations checklist and evaluation protocol will be drafted and presented to the Administrator. Evaluation protocol ensures that there is transparency. All staff will be required to sign a document acknowledging the new staff expectations and evaluation system.	July 1, 2011	Human Resources Administration, Senior Leadership	In house staff will conduct action step.	March-May 2011: Weekly Cabinet meetings will document discussions regarding the development of staff expectations and evaluations. May 2011: draft of staff evaluation protocol submitted to Administration. June 2011: returning staff will sign document acknowledging the updated staff expectations and evaluation system.
All staff will be provided with TS3 level training on the new staff expectations and evaluation system.	July- August, 2011.	Human Resources, Director of Compliance and Assessment.	Approximate \$2500 to conduct a state wide meeting on TS3. This will be part of a larger training program being provided as GOAL U on a semiannual basis. The overall cost of	June 30, 2011: TS3 training schedule will be finalized. July- August 2011: trainings will occur at TS3 level.

			the PD program has not been determined.	
Area Directors will work with TS3 teams to educate staff of data driven decision making strategies and other tools necessary to monitor student progress and course completion (additional details are listed within Improvement Strategy #4).	August 2011	Director of Innovation, Academic Directors Regional Directors, Director of Compliance and Assessment.	In house staff will conduct action step.	Professional development will begin August 2011.

Major Improvement Strategy #3: Streamlining enrollment process

Root Cause(s) Addressed: GOAL Academy had limited enrollment procedures, limited capacity for record keeping, and limited “body of evidence” when placing students into courses.

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

- School Plan under State Accountability
 Title IA School Improvement/Corrective Action Plan
 Application for a Tiered Intervention Grant
 Title I schoolwide or targeted assistance plan requirements
 School Improvement Grant

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks
Completion of purchase of online database, forms processing, and online admissions software. Workflow design and implementation of online admissions process.	April 25, 2011	Director of Innovation Senior Leadership Director of Admissions	In house staff will conduct action step.	Purchase and design of online enrollment database and imaging software.
<i>Enrollment and Admissions</i> team (created in December 2010) will finalize Enrollment process. Reevaluate and redesign as needed current	March 2011	Director of Admissions	In house staff will conduct action step.	March 2011: Enrollment and admissions team finalizing the 2011-12 school year process. Final

<p>enrollment guidelines which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of required state documents and other necessary enrollment packet documents; • Initial BASI and alternative assessment; • Verification that site coordinator has scanned and indexed (with set of Index identifiers) documents into the Imaging system; • Ensure that transcripts have been requested and received; • Site coordinator will scan and index (with set of Index identifiers) documents into the Imaging system; • A notification will be sent to counselor stating that they have new documents in their queue for review. Once the counselor reviews and assigns student to grade level then it will go to the assigned teacher AD, and finally into the Records department for proper cum records storage. 		<p>Director of Innovation Senior Leadership</p>		<p>draft to be submitted to GOAL administration by March 30, 2011.</p> <p>July 1, 2011: <i>Enrollment and Admissions</i> team will report to Cabinet during weekly meetings from July 1, - September 30, 2011.</p>
<p>After enrollment is complete and students have been assigned to a grade level, ensure that all students have a completed MyGOAL process.</p>	<p>July 1, 2011- September 30, 2011.</p>	<p>Teachers Counselors TS3's Academic Directors</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>July 2011: Completion rates will be presented at weekly Cabinet meetings.</p>
<p>Professional Development with statewide Academic Directors, Site Coordinators, and TS3's of approved Enrollment Admissions process.</p>	<p>July 1, 2011</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>July 2011: Professional Development schedule approved by Cabinet August 2011: trainings will begin throughout the state.</p>

				September 2011: PD Team will provide Cabinet with update of plan implementation.
--	--	--	--	--

Major Improvement Strategy #4: Monitoring of student progress.

Root Cause(s) Addressed: In 2009-10 there was little to no verification and monitoring of the student’s progress: survival mode was paramount. Today (2010-11) there is no student information system available that can pull all student data from GOAL’s eight separate curriculums into 1 single system. Teachers must manually enter student progress into a “homemade” system. This process is time consuming and not reliable.

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

- School Plan under State Accountability
 Title IA School Improvement/Corrective Action Plan
 Application for a Tiered Intervention Grant
 Title I schoolwide or targeted assistance plan requirements
 School Improvement Grant

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks
Strategic Planning Team (SPT) has been researching alternatives to current student information system. At the moment Sycamore (current SIS) cannot retrieve student achievement data from NovaNET.	Ongoing	Director of Innovation.	The school needs to make a determination that the current SIS system can be upgraded or a replacement found. The overall budget for this \$100,000 (estimated) purchase will come from a combination of state counselor grants funds and administrative funds from the schools state share funds (PPR).	March 2011: Cabinet minutes document current obstacles within Sycamore and the research being conducted on alternative SIS. April 2011: Office of Innovation meeting with alternative SIS. Progress reported within weekly Cabinet meetings.
SIS options: Option A; Renew Sycamore’s contact, and pay for “special enhancements” that would allow MOST of the curricula to be placed in a central system. Option B: Continue to explore “Exceed” program.	July 1, 2011	Administration, Director of Innovation	A: Hiring a programmer to work for GOAL to enhance and or develop ongoing improvements approximately \$80 to \$95 k per annual. Possible	May 2011: Cabinet and Board have final candidates and options available to make 2011-12 decision for SIS. July 2011: Decision and contract with SIS signed.

<p>Downfall is it is expensive Option C: Look into building a custom system. Even more expensive but custom built for GOAL and our needs. Ongoing: Continue to explore new open source and bundled SIS systems to see if they may be better fits to GOAL's need of open entry open exit competency based system.</p>			<p>outsourcing. GOAL may pay Sycamore to develop these enhancements</p>	<p>July – September 2011: PD trainings on SIS to all staff.</p>
<p>Student Advocacy Program is being beta tested in the Pueblo area. Continuation of program will be based on May 2011 student progress reports. Current figures indicate that the program has dramatically increased student engagement.</p>	<p>February-May 2011</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>May 2011: Continuation of Advocacy program will be determined based on data and percent of student reengagement into GOAL.</p>
<p>Upon enrollment, student expectations and required participation and course completion requirements will be explained and all students will be required to sign a contract. This contract is part of GOAL's <i>Enrollment Packet and discussed during MyGOAL class.</i></p>	<p>July 1- September 30, 2011.</p>	<p>Senior Leadership Teachers Counselors Academic Directors</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>July - September, 2011: Cabinet minutes will document percent of students with completed <i>Enrollment Packets</i>. September 1, 2011: 90% of students <i>Enrollment Packets</i> are completed. October 1, 2011: 100% of students <i>Enrollment Packets</i> are completed.</p>
<p>Evaluation of BASI. GOAL is currently administering the BASI in the fall and spring. An evaluation of the BASI's accuracy in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability level placement • tracking of fall to spring growth for individual students, and cohorts of students. 	<p>June 2011</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>March 2011: Senior Leadership has been communicating with Pearson regarding validity and norming of the BASI. April- June 2011: Senior Leadership will examine BASI spring data and prepare pre-post growth data.</p>
<p>Adoption of alternative assessment. GOAL will continue to work with CDE and other state Alternative Education Center (AEC) schools with</p>	<p>March 2011- June 2012.</p>	<p>Senior Leadership</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>February 2011: Senior Leadership administered a survey to most online schools in Colorado</p>

<p>recommendations for AEC standards and academic expectations as well as recommendations on suggested AEC alternative assessments (e.g. Scantron, MAP, Accuplacer). GOAL staff will report to GOAL Board on CDE suggestions and alternative assessment will be in place by 2012-13 school year.</p>				<p>regarding asking them about the current and historical alternative assessment they use, as well as the benefits and challenges of the assessments. Results are being used to assist GOAL is selecting alternative assessment .</p> <p>March –June 2011: GOAL staff will attend AEC meetings hosted at the League.</p> <p>May 2011: Senior Leadership will present to the Board a list of possible assessments. Board will make final decision by June 2011.</p> <p>August –October 2011: all students will be administered the alternative assessment (fall assessment).</p> <p>April – June 2012: all students will be administered the alternative assessment (spring assessment).</p>
<p>Professional development on staff identified needs as well as data driven instruction will be conducted throughout the summer and fall of 2011.</p> <p>As part of GOAL's <i>Strategic Improvement Plan</i>, all staff will receive continued (quarterly) professional development. Training will include but not be limited to: how to read transcripts, historical CSAP and alternative assessment data and how to create MYGOAL based on assessment results.</p>	<p>May, 2012</p>	<p>Senior Leadership GOAL U Team PD Team</p>	<p>In house staff will conduct action step.</p>	<p>April 2011: Professional Development needs will be identified (via staff survey).</p> <p>May 2011: PD trainings will be scheduled for the summer of 2011.</p> <p>August 2011: 90% of staff have attended PD trainings</p> <p>November 2011- May 2012: GOAL Academic Directors will oversee implementation of students ICAP and course completion strategies via MYGOAL reports submitted by staff.</p>