



Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2004-2005 <input type="button" value="Go"/>	Form: Print Summary <input type="button" value="Go"/> <input type="button" value="Exit"/>
District: 1701 Name: Denison Comm School District	

Bureau of Administration and School Improvement Services
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)
Constant Conversation Questions
Print Summary 2004-2005
Five-Year Plan for 2004-2005 -- 2008-2009

CSIP Answers Cannot Be Changed.
The entire certification process has been completed for this district.
CSIP answers CAN be ported over to a future form's year to be modified, see the bottom of a future year's Status form for this utility.

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

All

I. What do data tell us about our student-learning needs?

- A. What data do we collect?** The district collects the following data: (**LRDA1**)
- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED reading and mathematics at grades 4, 8, and 11
 - Trend line data for ITBS/ITED science for grades 8 and 11
 - Graduation rate
 - Grade 7-12 dropout percentages (aggregate and by subgroup)
 - Percentage of graduates planning to pursue postsecondary education
 - Percentage of graduates completing the core curriculum (
 - Career and technical education (CTE) student data (e.g., 11th grade participants' proficiency in reading and mathematics, program completers, and occupational competency)
 - Percentage of high school students achieving a score or status on a measure indicating probable postsecondary success.
 - Trend line data from the Iowa Youth Survey (grades 6, 8, and 11) (**SDF1, SDF3, and SDF4**)
 - A comprehensive, community-wide needs assessment which includes input from community members, parents, administrators, staff, and students (**LC3, LC5**)
 - Participation rates for required district-wide assessments (grades 3-8, 11)
 - Aggregate and subgroup attendance data (grades K-12)
 - District developed math assessment, Gates McGinitie Reading Assessment, and District developed Science Assessment. Assessment validity and reliability determined through ITAP.
 - K-3 Diagnostic Assessment QR III and DIBELS
 - Iowa Youth Survey
 - K-12 Credentialing (NCA)(**LRDA4**)
 - Iowa Test System Analysis Reading, Mathematics, Science (grades 3-11)

- WEB Portal Attendance, demographics, student assessment (grades K-12)

The data have been used to establish biennium trend lines which are updated annually and reported in the Annual Progress Report which is posted on the district web page. Using Iowa norms, the district has established a trend line of system item analysis for ITBS and ITED data for grades 3 through 11. This data is used to determine the percent of student successfully responding to test items compared to Iowa data for reading, mathematics, and science. An analysis of the data along with other trend lines assists the district in knowing how well students are achieving, the alignment of curriculum k-12, and areas of need for professional development of staff. (LRDA1)

During the 2001-02 school year, a web portal was developed and implemented. The portal is a web accessible database of student demographic and assessment information. The data is used to identify student needs and provide individualized instruction as well as compiling and analyzing district data for improved instruction and staff development. The web portal also collects data for the NCA Transitions process of credentialing students in the core academic areas, employability, and career awareness. This data is used at the building level to determine instructional, curriculum, and professional development needs and at the district level to identify trend lines of student achievement and graduation standards.

B. How do we collect and analyze data to determine prioritized student-learning needs?

District Leadership Team (DLT)

The district established a District Leadership Team (DLT) with teachers from elementary, middle, and high school representing their buildings in general and special education. The three building principals, the superintendent of schools, building level counselors, and technology coordinator serve on the team. The team serves its district organizing and analyzing district data, identifying trend lines, determining priorities for the district, and finalizing district professional development based on priorities. The District Leadership Team also acts as a vehicle for communication between the schools and district in carrying out the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan and implementation of instructional strategies to improve student achievement. The DLT monitors district progress in meeting the long range student goals for academic achievement to meet NCLB requirements (2013) and Climate goal for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Community. (LRDA 1,2,3,4 and SDF1,2,3)

Building Leadership Team (BLT)

Each building established a Building Leadership Team (BLT) with teachers representing their disciplines in general and special education. The building level principal and counselor also serve on the team. The team collects and analyzes student data and implementation data of instructional strategies implemented at the building level. Student data includes credentialing information, standardized test data, diagnostic data at the K-3 level, attendance, discipline referrals, climate data. Data is reviewed by total student population and subpopulations. This information is shared with the building staff at faculty and professional development meetings. Data is used to drive the on-going professional development during the school year. (LRDA 1,2,3,4 and SDF1,2,3)

Stakeholder Groups

District and building level information is shared with Denison Board of Education and District Advisory Committee (DAC) members and other community organizations. The DAC uses the information to make recommendations to the District Board of Education prioritizing needs, long range goals, professional development and programs and services provided to students. The DAC meets regularly during the year to provide input into the design of the CSIP and the long range goals and monitors student progress in meeting the goals. (LRDA 1,2,3,4 and SDF1,2,3)

C. What did we learn through this data analysis? Student achievement:(LRDA 2)

Reading Data: Analysis of Iowa Test Proficiency Level Trend Line 1998-2004: Students proficient remains stable at the grade 4 but increased this year going from 60% to 67%. At grade 8 there was an increase the last two years in # of students proficient with 70% proficient this year. At grade 11 there was an increase in # of student proficient since 00-01 with a proficiency rate of 80%. At grades 4, 8, 11 females scored above males by 3 to 5 percent. The difference the last two years at grade 11 was 7 and 10 points. At grades 4, 8, 11, since 98 average/high SES students achieved as much as 40 points above low SES. Gap between white and Hispanic students at grades 4, 8, 11 does not narrow as students move the system or year to year.

Analysis of Iowa Test System Item Trend Line from 01 to 04:(LRDA2) Fewer students answer items correctly than Iowa students in grades 3-11 in vocabulary and all areas of reading comprehension. K-3 reading achievement QRI III and DIBELS shows growth in fluency, phonemic awareness and vocabulary. Fluency and vocabulary has improved but scores remain below the norms on all four levels (grades K-3).

Mathematics Data (LRDA2)

Analysis of Iowa Test Student Proficiency Level Trend Line 98-04:The # students proficient changed from 62% last year to 70% this year. At grade 11 more females scored at proficiency than males except for last year, when more males scored by 3%. At grades 4, 8, 11, there is a gap between # of students scoring at proficiency for average/high SES and low SES students. There is a gap between % of students at proficiency for white and Hispanic students.

Analysis of Iowa Test System Item Trend from 01 to 04:(LRDA2) In grades 3,4, and 5 students responded correctly to items of concepts and estimations near or above the state norm for the last three year. Fewer students in grades 3-8 responded correctly to items on problem solving the last three years than students in Iowa. Fewer students in grades 6, 7, and 8 responded correctly to items on concepts/estimations and problem solving than Iowa students. In 01-02 and 02-03 more students responded correctly to items of fractions than Iowa students but not in 03-04.

Science Data (LRDA2)

Analysis of Iowa Test Proficiency Level Trend Line 98-04: Females outscored males at proficiency since 99-00 by 4 to 10 percents. Grades showed a gap in # of students of average/high SES and low SES. The students of average/high SES increased in proficiency from year to year, but not low SES. White students outscored Hispanic students. Students in middle school scored below state in Life Science. Students in the middle school were above the state data in Scientific Inquiry.

Analysis of Iowa Test System Item from 2001 to 2004: (LRDA2) The % of students responding to items has improved from 01 to 04, but not at grade 11. Analyzing/Evaluating information is below the state data. Since 2001, students in grade 8 showed a lack of growth of those who responded to items correctly and are below state data in in all areas of science.

Analysis of High School Seniors Intending to Pursue Post-Secondary Education (LRDA2), Indicators of Post-Secondary Success,(LRDA2) and Graduates Completing Core Program:(LRDA2) The # of high school graduates intending to pursue post-secondary education remains consistent the last three years (89%). The # of high school students achieving at least a score of 20 on the ACT has remained on average around 65% the last three years. The # of high school seniors who completed a core program showed a decrease in the last three years going from 63% to 56%.Dropout Rate:(LRDA2) For grades 7-12 rate has remained around 1% the last three years.

Analysis of locally determined indicators(LRDA3&4):The # of 4th. graders meeting credential standards for Literacy 66.4%, Mathematics 69.1%, Employability 89.1% and Career Awareness 99.1%. Number of 8th. graders meeting credential standards for Reading 78.1%, Writing 84.2%, Mathematics 82.5%, Science 84.2%, Employability 76.3%, and Career Awareness 100%. Number of 11th. graders meeting credential standards for Reading 63.1%, Writing 55.7%, Mathematics 67.1%, Science 54%, Employability 67.1%, and Career Awareness 95.

Iowa Youth Survey(**SDF1, SDF2, SDF3, SDF4**): Comparing survey item responses of 02 to 99: More students said it was wrong to discriminate against others because of race, economic, or cultural differences. More students felt there were harmful effects to smoking, but fewer students felt alcohol was harmful. More students said it was wrong to drink alcohol to have fun and the same number of students responded both years saying alcohol made parties more fun. More students in 2002 said there are plenty of chances to get involved in after school activities and they could go to an adult at school for help 85% (02)83%(99). Fewer students in 02 said their parents would think it is wrong to use alcohol, smoke, or use marijuana. In 02 more students thought students treated each other with respect but fewer students felt safe at school with 73% responding compared to 87% in 99. Most students said they had never tried marijuana but those who did were between 13-16 years old. Incidents of teachers needing to discipline in the classroom was low both years. More students reported between 6 or more hours a week of homework in 02 than students in 99 (26% in 99 and 39% in 02). In middle school 3 students received out of school suspension and at the high school 51 students were suspended. Staff, Student, and Parent Questionnaire, (Success 4)(LC#1, LC#5, **LRDA4, SDF1, 2, 3, 4**) Students and parents rated the district at the high effective range in stating rules and expectations for student behavior. Students rated adults treating students with respect higher than they rated students treating each other with respect. Students rated their school environment higher as a safe environment than staff did with scoring ranging in the adequate to effective range. Parents rated the staff higher in motivating students to learn than students did; however both ratings were in the effective range.

D. From the data analysis, what are our prioritized student needs? Based on the data reviewed, we developed the following list of prioritized student needs: (**LC4**)

Reading

At the elementary, middle, and high school level, the gap between the number of students scoring at the proficiency level who are average or high socioeconomic level and students who are low socioeconomic level needs to be closed. (This includes Hispanic students)

Students at all grade levels need to show improvement in vocabulary acquisition.

Reading comprehension at the elementary and middle school needs to improve in all areas: factual understanding, inference and interpretation, and analysis and generalization

At the high school level reading comprehension in factual information needs to show improvement

Mathematics

The gap between students scoring at the proficiency level for average/high socio-economic and low socio-economic status at the elementary, middle, and high school levels needs to close. (This includes Hispanic students)

At the elementary, middle, and high school level, all students must show improvement in problem solving

At the middle and high school students must show improvement in concepts and estimation reasoning.

At the high school level, students need to improve in algebraic manipulations

Science

The gap between students scoring at the proficiency level for average/high socio-economic and low socio-economic status at middle and high school needs to close. (This includes Hispanic students)

Eighth grade students need to improve in science achievement especially in life science.

Climate

The learning environment must be supportive and responsive to the learning, social and emotional needs of the diverse student body

The learning environment must support and encourage respect for all individuals in the district

E. How will we develop goals and actions based upon the prioritized needs? The district leadership team and the district advisory committee will use the prioritized needs to craft and recommend goal statements to the board of education for adoption. The district and building level leadership teams will determine scientifically researched based strategies and actions that align with and support the established goals for the next five years and building level annual goals.

II. What do/will we do to meet student-learning needs?

A. What long-range goals have been established to support prioritized student needs?

District Student Learning Goals (LC6)

Meaningful-----apply learning to real life situations

connect learning among subject areas

exhibit an attitude of life long learning

Socially Responsible-----accept individual responsibility

work well with others

function successfully in the local and world community

Grounded in Each Subject's

Basic Content-----read, write, speak and listen; solve mathematical problems,

use technology, apply the core concepts from subjects

Emphasizes Thinking Skills-think creatively, organize information, make decisions,

solve problems, reason, know how to learn

District Long-Range Goals

Goal 1:All K-12 students: Reading(LRG1,MCGF3,AR6,EIG1)

All students K-12 will achieve at high levels in reading comprehension, prepared for success beyond high school

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 1:

1a.Number of students who score at or above the proficiency level on the ITBS reading comprehension test in grades 3 through 8 and using the ITED reading comprehension test in Grade 11 including data disaggregated by subgroups.

1b.Number of students in grades 1-3 who are independent readers at grade level on the QRI III and DIBELS

1c.District proficiency levels remain above state trajectory including safe harbor and bands of competency

Goal 2:All K-12 students: Mathematics(LRG2,MCGF3,AR6,EIG1)

All students in K-12 will achieve at high levels in mathematics, prepared for success beyond high school

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 2:

2a.Number of students who score at or above the proficiency level on the ITBS mathematics total test in grades 3 through 8 and using the ITED Mathematics test in Grade 11 including data disaggregated by subgroups.

2b.District proficiency levels remain above state trajectory including safe harbor and bands of competency

Goal 3:All K-12 students: Science(LRG3,MCGF3,AR6,EIG1)

All students in K-12 will achieve at high levels in science, prepared for success beyond high school

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 3:

3a.Number of students who score at or above the proficiency level on the ITBS science total test in grades 5 and 8 and using the ITED Mathematics test in Grade 11 including data disaggregated by subgroups.

3b.Number of students who score at or above the proficiency level on district developed science

assessment in grades 4, 8, and 11.

Goal 4: All K-12 students: Technology(FTP1)

All K-12 students will use technology in developing proficiency in reading, mathematics, and science.

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 4:

4a.The indicators identified for Goals 1, 2, and 3.

4b.Number of students at grade 8 who score at the proficient level or above on a locally developed technology assessment (E2T2).

Goal 5: All K-12 students: Climate(SDF5, SDF6, SDF7).

All students (K-12)will feel safe and respected at and connected to school, prepared for success beyond high school.

The following indicators will measure district progress with goal 5:

5a.Attendance rate as measured by the average daily attendance data

5b.Graduation rate as

5c.Number of students in middle school that receive discipline referrals (in school and out of school suspensions)

5d.Number of students that report they feel safe, respected, and protected on the Iowa Youth Survey

B. What process will be used to determine what we will do to meet the long-range goals?

The District Leadership Team, the Building Leadership Team and the District Advisory Committee will determine actions and strategies to meet the goals. The district will use the Iowa Professional Development Model process to develop its District Career Development Plan and an action research design to assist in making goal progress. At the three levels, staff members along with the building level principal have established study teams and have completed action research based on student data in reading, mathematics, science, and climate. The middle school is involved in the statewide math initiative Every Student Counts and the Federal and State program E2T2 improving reading achievement and integration of technology. The building will continue with both initiatives for the next two years. Actions will be developed in all three buildings to provide K-12 system alignment of meeting the district long range goals and address the learning needs for the diverse population in the district including ELL, at-risk, gifted and talented, and early intervention at the K-3 grades.

C. What is our current practice to support these long-range goals? 1.Instructional Strategies

Currently Used in the District

Guided Reading elementary

Guided Writing elementary

Shared Reading elementary

Interactive Writing elementary

Independent Writing elementary

Visual Phonics elementary

Teaching the Text Backwards elementary and ELL

Read Alouds elementary and middle

Vocabulary (Beck Strategies)middle

Comprehension graphic organizers with nonfiction middle, high

Leveled Reading middle

Peer Coaching middle

Unlocking the science text middle

Study guides in science middle

KU Strategies high

Active Reading Strategies high

Six Column Questioning and Predicting high

White Boards (math) high

Action Planners (At-risk) high
 Extended Learning gifted high

2. Instructional Programs/Services Supports Currently Used in the District

Enhancing English Language Learning in the
 Content Area by Lynda Franco elementary, ELL, At-Risk
 Literature Circles by Daniels elementary
 Closing the Achievement Gap by Freeman & Freeman elementary
 Word Journeys Rebecca Sitton Spelling Program elementary, ELL
 Read 180 Scholastic elementary, middle
 Rigby Language Arts elementary ELL
 Lakeshore-Listen and Learn Letter sounds elementary ELL
 Reading Counts elementary, ELL, middle
 Read A Million Minutes middle
 E2T2 middle
 Every Student Counts middle
 PETS primary gifted
 HOTS elementary gifted
 Extended units middle school gifted
 Title I Part A: Reading Programs/Services elementary
 Title II Technology usage
 Title III Language Instruction for ELL elementary
 Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program/Services elementary, middle, high Perkins:
 Vocational and Technical Education Programs high school
 Gifted and Talented Programs elementary, middle, high
 Special Education Programs/Services elementary, middle, high
 Mentoring and Induction Program
 Alternative High School high
 Denison Job Corp high
 Denison Alternative High School high
 College Credit ICN gifted high
 Dual Credit WITCC gifted high

3. System-wide Management Supports Currently Used in the District

Portal System using Technology
 NCA Credentialing Program
 Policy Development
 Personnel Evaluation System
 Curriculum Development
 ITAP
 CSIP Teams

D. How is our current practice aligned with or supported by the research base? Current Practices Supported by Research and/or Local Data.

The district has worked with the AEA consultants to determine the research and student data that supports the use of the district study teams and initiatives that the district is using with students to improve learning in reading. The district also used the Iowa Content Area Networks to access information about practices supported by scientifically-based research. Reading and mathematics initiatives at the middle school use the Iowa Professional Development model process and instructional strategies have a scientifically-based research basis. Elementary

programs at the K-3 level were reviewed and approved in their adoption through state recommendation.

Research Needed

The District Leadership Team along with assistance from the AEA will review the practices and strategies for ELL students and at-risk learners particularly the program of Lynda Franco for scientifically-based research. As the district examines needs in mathematics in problem solving and science instructional strategies, the District Leadership Team will review the information available through the Iowa Content Area Networks for mathematics, and science.

Program/Services Current Practice.

The building level and district level Leadership Teams will use a goal-oriented approach to program evaluation (clear expectations, results data, and targeted program/services evaluation) to determine program effectiveness relative to district goals and program goals.

E. What gaps exist between our current practice to support long-range goals and the research base (include curriculum and instruction)?

Curriculum/Assessment Alignment
The district participated in the ITAP process through the AEA in aligning standards, benchmarks, and grade level expectations to the Iowa Tests and district developed assessments at the elementary, middle, and high school. When the district adopted the NCA Credentialing model, there was alignment of student achievement on identified credentialing assessment from elementary, to middle, to high school transitions. The next step the district plans to complete is a building level review of the taught curriculum and the assessed curriculum. The system item analysis indicates this review needs to be completed K-12. Once buildings complete their review of curriculum, there will be a system-wide review of the taught curriculum.

Instructional Strategy Decisions

The middle school because of its involvement in the state math and federal/state reading initiative has identified its focus area based on student data and instructional strategies in the classroom for reading and mathematics teachers. The entire middle school staff will address student target areas for professional development for all staff that will improve student achievement in the content area building-wide. At the elementary and high school, staff will identify the instructional strategies that all staff will receive professional development in and implementation of strategies will be building-wide. Because of the wide use of study groups, recommendation will come from staff based on student data, priorities of the district, and long range goals. Based on scientifically-based research, instructional strategies that address the needs of at-risk students and ELL students in reading and mathematics will be identified at the elementary, middle, and high school. Areas to address are reading comprehension including vocabulary and problem solving in mathematics and number concepts. The district will explore instructional strategies/programs that will help staff to understand the concept of poverty and the implications for learning. The climate goal will address the need for tolerance within the district for all groups of people. The district will contact the AEA for assistance.

F. What actions/activities will we use to address prioritized needs, established goals, and any gaps between current and research-based practice?

Actions for LRG 1,2,3 Implement the district career development plan (professional development program PD(AMN1,AMN2,AMN3,IEI1,PERK1,SPED1,TQ3,TQ4,TQ7,FTP3,4&5,LEP1,PD6)
The district career development plan describes district-level PD efforts aligned with prioritized student needs. The PD target is comprehension in the content area: retelling, main idea, summarizing, and drawing inferences. In mathematics, emphasis is on problem solving. PD target is based on achievement data, system item analysis, credentialing data, and review of current PD results from previous years. Elem:Technology PD in Inspiration: MS in Plycom: HS in Powerpoint and Keynotes. This aligns with long range goals #1,#2,#3PD6,TQ1,TQ2,3,4,FTP3,EP1, &PD6)Plan describes a cycle in which PD efforts target student learning until student gains are acquired. At least 80% of PD time and resources focus

on learning new content and strategies. **(TQ3, TQ4, FTP3, LEP1)** Research-based Strategies. **(PD5, SDF9)** The DLT used information from The Iowa Content Network for Reading and Math., The NRP, and AEA 12 to determine strategies that resulted in student achievement and had a research base. Participation. **(PERK1, SPED1, LEP1, TQ6, TQ8, PD5)**: All staff at each building to be trained, including those in Title I, Spec. Ed., at-risk, ELL, and G/T. Training to be facilitated by an external expert in comprehension in the content area. Training dates and agendas determined by each BLT with coordination through DLT. All staff to attend PD training, and demonstrate use of strategies. Training includes using implementation and student achievement data to drive skill development, and the moves of adult PD including review/study of theory, demonstration/modeling, practice and feedback. All staff to use technology to enhance learning. PD Content. 04-05, All professional instructional staff implement the instructional strategies: **FTP2, FTP4**

FTP5, AR7, AMN1, AMN2, AMN3) Goal 1: Reading **(LRG1, LRG2, LRG3, MCGF3, AR6, EIG1)** All students K-12 will achieve at high levels in comprehension, prepared for success beyond high school: Measures of district progress: 1a. Students who score at proficiency on the ITBS reading comprehension test grades 3-8 and ITED reading comprehension test Grade 11 including data disaggregated by subgroups. 1b. Students in grades 1-3 who are independent readers at grade level on the QRI III and DIBELS. District PD Target for 04-05 school year: Improve student comprehension in the content area: retelling, main idea, summarizing, and drawing inferences for all students (k-12) with appropriate subject matter adaptation for all subgroups: ELL, G/T, at-risk, early intervention. District data supports priority **(LC5)**: 4,8,11 grades females out score males by 3 to 10 percent. 4,8,11 grades average/high SES students achieve higher than low SES students. Gap between proficiency of white and Hispanic students at the 4,8,11 grades. Fluency and vocabulary (k-3) remain below the norms on all four levels. Design for 04-05 School Year: Elem: Focus Area: Main Idea, Retelling, and Summarizing Content: **(FTP2, FTP4, AR7, AMN1, 2, & 3)**: Read Alouds and Think Alouds Training Dates: Preschool Service 4 hrs; Weekly Teaming 13.5 hrs; Monthly Staff Meetings 4.5 hrs; Inservices 6 hrs; Jan. Inservice 7 hrs; Individual Classroom Implementation 8 hrs; Areas to be covered in Inservices: Review of data and purpose of target area, Review of CSIP and PD Design, Read Alouds, determine science, social studies, math units **(AMN1, AMN2, AMN3)** for Read Alouds; Weekly Teaming: Read Alouds theory, modeling Read Alouds, Modeling implementation logs, planning/practice Read Alouds, assignment: complete logs and implementation of strategy. Monthly Staff Meetings: Analyze and review student and implementation data. Individual Classroom Implementation: implementation of Read Alouds, teacher observation. MS: Focus Area: Main Idea, Summarizing, Drawing Inferences: Content: **(FTP2, FTP4, AR7, AMN1, 2, & 3)** Graphic Organizers and Recognizing/Using Text Structures. Training Dates: Preschool Service-4 hrs, Bimonthly Teaming-12 hrs, Monthly Staff Meetings-4.5 hrs, Inservices-6 hrs, Jan Inservice-7 hrs, Individual Classroom Implementation-8 hrs: Every Student Counts-40 hrs, E2T2-40 hrs: Areas covered: Review of data and purpose of target area, CSIP and PD Design, Graphic Organizers, Analysis and review of data from logs; Bimonthly Teaming: Theory, Modeling graphic organizers, implementation log, Planning and practice in grade level groups; Monthly Staff Meetings: Review of theory "Supporting Struggling Readers and Writers"; Individual Classroom Implementation: Implementation of graphic organizers, Teacher observation: Every Student Counts and E2T2 Initiatives: Common training sessions four times a year in all day workshops. HS: Focus Area: Main Idea, Summarizing, Determining Relevant Information: Content: **(FTP2, FTP4, AR7, AMN1, 2, & 3)**: On-line Visual Tools for Literacy: Training Dates: Bimonthly 2 hour training sessions-26 hrs., Review of data and purpose of target area, Review of CSIP and PD Design, Visual Tools, theory, modeling and implementation of strategy, analysis of student and implementation data.

Goal 5: K-12 Climate: All students will feel safe at and connected to school, prepared for success beyond high school **(SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)**. Measures of district progress with Goal 5: 5a. Attendance rate 5b. Graduation rate 5c. MS students discipline referrals 5d. Students report they feel safe, respected, and protected. PD Focus 04-05: Tolerance: Focus on developing tolerance at the elem, MS, and HS for diversity of others, respect for each other and create a culture of acceptance. Career development plan will include district-wide PD for all staff and students. District data that supports priority: 2002 more students thought they treated each other with

respect but fewer felt safe at school with only 73% responding compared to 87% in 99. Content: A Framework for Understanding Poverty by R. K. Payne, PhD and Pursuing Victory with Honor by R. Scott and C.J. Niles. Research Base: DLT to review research provided through the Iowa Content Network to support the implementation of the work of Payne, Scott, and Niles. (SDF9) Design for 04-05: The DLT will plan with BLT inservice/training. AEA consultants provide the PD. Each BLT determine how best to provide the schedule, agenda, and training for the program. Consistency and collaboration of the training will be through DLT. Training Schedule: Training for staff by building level and facilitated by an external expert from AEA 12. Content begins with an understanding of poverty and how it impacts the achievement of students. Training will include modeling of strategies and integration with the comprehension in the content area.

G. How will we support implementation of the identified actions? Collaboration and Implementation Plan (Comprehension in the content area)

The DLT and BLT will meet in common planning times to analyze and review implementation data of student and staff, plan district-wide inservices based on the calendar approved by the Board of Education, and provide direction for the district PD. Meetings will be facilitated by the BLT and AEA critical friend. Teams will develop implementation logs for Read Alouds, graphic organizers, and CRISS strategies, set the timeline for implementation collection periods, and monitor the achievement of district long range goals of #1, #2, #3, #4, #5. All staff will learn how to complete logs listing the moves of strategies in the classroom to improve student achievement and improved behaviors of tolerance and respect for others. Building level meetings and inservices will be used to discuss the data and monitor student improvement, model and practice strategies, collaborate with others for implementation of strategies in the classroom.

Evaluation Elementary
Formative (TQ1, #2, #5)

The staff will collect, analyze and discuss the implementation logs for Read Alouds
„XStudent data using quarterly student classroom assessment of comprehension will be collected, analyzed, and discussed.
„XRigby Assessment for grades k-3 and Jamestown Reading Assessments for grades 5-6 will be collected, analyzed, and discussed.
„XObservation notes will be used from administrative observations and curriculum leader observations.

Summative (TQ1, #2, #5)

„XReading comprehension subtest of ITBS for grades 3-5 will be collected to determine the number of students scoring at the proficiency level including subpopulations of students.
„XQR III and DIBELS assessment for grades 1-3 will be collected to determine the number of students scoring at the proficiency level including subpopulations of students.
„XData will be reviewed comparing student proficiency numbers compared to high implementing staff members.

Evaluation Middle School

Formative (TQ1, #2, #5)

„XThe staff will collect, analyze and discuss the implementation logs for graphic organizers.
„XStudent data using quarterly student classroom assessment of comprehension will be collected, analyzed, and discussed.
„XObservation notes will be used from administrative observations and curriculum leader observations.

Summative (TQ1)

„XReading comprehension subtest of ITBS for grades 6-8 will be collected to determine the number of students scoring at the proficiency level including subpopulations of students.
„XGates McGinitie Reading Assessment data will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed.
„XData will be reviewed comparing student proficiency numbers compared to high implementing

staff members.

Evaluation High School
Formative (TQ1, #2, #5)

„XThe staff will collect, analyze and discuss the implementation logs for graphic organizers.

„XStudent data using quarterly student classroom assessment of comprehension will be collected, analyzed, and discussed.

„XObservation notes will be used from administrative observations and curriculum leader observations.

Summative (TQ1, #2, #5)

„XReading comprehension subtest of ITED for grades 9-11 will be collected to determine the number of students scoring at the proficiency level including subpopulations of students.

„XReading comprehension subtest of Constructed Response of ITED for eleventh grade will be collected to determine number of students scoring at the proficiency level.

„XCredentialing assessment data will be collected to determine the number of students who met the credentialing criteria.

„XData will be reviewed comparing student proficiency numbers compared to high implementing staff members.

Alignment with the Iowa Teaching Standards.

These professional development actions align directly with the following Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria: (TQ Standard 1, TQ Standard 2, TQ Standard 3, TQ Standard 4, TQ Standard 5, TQ Standard 7 TQ Standard 8.) All staff members are expected to attend inservice meetings, complete implementation logs using instructional strategies to improve comprehension in the content area. All staff members are to analyze and review student data to show improvement in student comprehension in the content area. All staff members are to collaborate and plan with colleagues in planning and implementing instruction of instructional strategies in the classroom. This includes mentors working with assigned new teacher(TQ5). One hundred percent of staff is to achieve executive control of the instructional strategy and show student improvement in comprehension in the content area: reading, mathematics, science, and social studies, and all other disciplines. (TQ1, AMN3)

Collaboration and implementation: Tolerance for Diversity of Others)

Teachers will complete a log of implementation of strategies of Payne, Scott, and Niles and record keeping of incidents of negative behaviors quarterly. The BLT will collect implementation logs and reported negative behaviors. Building level meetings will discuss and analyze data and monitor student improvement.

Evaluation (TQ #1 #2 #5)

Formative: The staff will collect, analyze, and discuss implementation logs and number of reported incidence of negative behaviors quarterly. The building leadership teams will analyze and review the collected data to determine effectiveness of implementation and the direction building needs to take in order to effectively develop tolerance in the school.

Summative (TQ#1 #2)

District-wide assessment of data as reported in the District Annual Progress Report (APR)

District-wide assessment data as collected in the Iowa Youth Survey to determine degree of student safety and respect in the district

District-wide data of incidents of negative student behavior

Alignment with the Iowa Teaching Standards.

These professional development actions align directly with the following Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria: TQ1, TQ2, TQ3, TQ4, TQ5, TQ7 TQ8. All staff members are expected to attend inservice meetings, complete implementation logs using instructional strategies to improve student behavior toward others. All staff members are to analyze and review student data to show improvement in student behavior. All staff members are to collaborate and plan with colleagues in planning and implementing instruction of instructional strategies in the classroom. One hundred percent of staff is to achieve executive control of the instructional strategy and

show student improvement in tolerance and respect for others. (TQ #1 #2)

III. How do/will we know that student learning has changed?

A. How will we know student learning has changed over time in relation to our long-range goals? A. How will we know student learning has changed over time in relation to our long-range goals? The district will use multiple data sources to determine if student learning has changed, including a combination of district-wide standardized assessments, grade level and classroom assessments, credentialing information, and surveys. Building level leadership teams will insure that data from the assessments are collected, analyzed, and shared with the district leadership team. All students enrolled at specific grade levels are included in the district-wide assessments. All K-3 students are included in the screening and diagnostic assessment using QRI III and DIBELS. (**DWAP1 DWAP4**)

Monitoring Progress with Long-Range CSIP Goals

Data will be analyzed by aggregation and disaggregation of trend line of the following sources: ITBS reading comprehension, mathematics total tests at grades 3-8, and the science test at grades 5 and 8 (Goals #1 and #4 **DWAP6**)

ITED reading comprehension, mathematics, and science tests at grade 11. (Goals #1 and #4 **DWAP6**)

QRI III and DIBELS tests at grades 1-3 (Goal #1) (**DWAP3,4,6**)

District Developed Assessment Mathematics tests at grades 4, 8, and 11 (Goal #2) **DWAP7**)

District Developed Science Assessment at grades 4, 8, and 11 (Goal #3) **DWAP8**)

District Screening/Diagnostic Assessment in reading (k-3) using QRI III and DIBELS for phonemic awareness, fluency, phonetic skills, and comprehension. (Goal # 1 DWAP 3 & 4)

District Developed Technology Assessment at grade 8 (Goal #4)

Attendance data from districts student information management system (Goal #5)

District graduation data as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education (Goal #5)

Data from the Iowa Youth Survey (Goal #5)

The percentage of the middle school and high school student body who receive a suspension, and/or expulsion (Goal #5)

Alignment of Standards and Assessments-Iowa Technical Adequacy Project (ITAP)

The district participated in the ITAP process for the Iowa Tests, QRI III, DIBELS, and district developed assessments in reading and mathematics. The spring of 2004 the district completed the ITAP process for the district developed science assessment. The staff at the AEA assisted the ITAP team in completing the process and aligning the district curriculum with the district-wide assessment.

Student Indicator Data Used for Evaluation of Programs and Services

The same student indicator data used to measure progress with CSIP goals will be used to make informed decisions regarding the effectiveness of the following programs and services:

Professional development for staff (District Career Development Plan and (Title II Part A)

Supplemental reading and mathematics services for eligible students (Title I Part A)

Use of technology to improve student achievement (Title II Part D)

Program and services to assist ELL Students (Title III Part A) (LEP 2)

Early Intervention Programs K-3 (**DWAP3 DWAP 4**)

K-12 At-risk program

K-12 gifted and talented program

Special education services

Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs

Additional Data Gathering and Analysis

Data points included in the APR

Student performance on district designed assessments (**DWAP4**)
 Percentage of students scoring at struggling reader (at-risk or deficit) category on QRIII and DIBELS for students K3. (Goal #1 **DWAP4**)
 Percentage of students scoring at 20-40th percentile on Iowa Tests and district credentialing assessments grades 3-8 and 11. (Goal #1 **DWAP6**)
 Data from end-of-year program report (Perkins)
 Data from Iowa Youth Survey reported on acceptance of diverse student population
 IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) for ELL students and/or Language Assessment Scale (LAS) to measure ELL students' English Proficiency (**LEP2**)
 Data from credentialing form

Formative Evaluation Data Gathering and Analysis
 Quarterly classroom assessment of comprehension in the content area (**DWAP6 DWAP4**)
 Biannual classroom assessment of observable positive student behavior

IV. How will we evaluate our programs and services to ensure improved student learning?

A. What strategies/process will we use to evaluate how well the activities included in Constant Conversation Question 2 (What do/will we do to meet student learning needs?) were implemented? A. What strategies/process will we use to evaluate how well the activities included in Constant Conversation Question #2 (What do/will we do to meet student learning needs?) were implemented?

Goal-Oriented Approach to Program Evaluation

Denison Community Schools has adopted a goal-oriented approach to formally evaluate the programs and services it offers to meet prioritized student needs as identified in its CSIP.

(**ECSIP1**) This goal-oriented approach to program evaluation includes the following components:

- Identification of programs that contribute to progress with CSIP goals (program expectations)
- Identification of any additional program goals (program expectations)
- Identification of variables which affect performance
- Identification of the indicators by which program effectiveness will be judged relative to performance
- Development of procedures for collecting information about performance
- Collection of performance data
- Comparison of the information regarding performance with the expected CSIP/program goals
- Communication of results of the comparison to appropriate audiences

Denison Community Schools will use a combination of formative and summative evaluation processes within the program evaluation process. (**TQ12**) The district will also determine the frequency of the formative and summative evaluation processes for each of the programs/services by two factors: 1) legal mandates and 2) local data. At a minimum, an in-depth formal summative evaluation for all of the programs that the district incorporates into its CSIP will occur within a five-year rotation.

The District Leadership Team recommended the following program rotation and timelines for in-depth summative program evaluation, using both student achievement data and teacher implementation data:

Program In-Depth Program Evaluation Rotation

Professional Development Program (District Career Development Plan) Annually, beginning in 2005 (**TQ10**, TQ 11)*

Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training/Recruiting) Note: Title II, Part A is embedded into the district career development plan. Annually, beginning in 2005 (**TPTR1**)*

Title I, Part A (Parent Involvement) Annually, beginning in 2005 (**TITL1**)*

Title II, Part D (E2T2) Every two years, beginning in 2005 (**FTP6**)*

Title IV (Safe and Drug Free Schools) Every three years, beginning in 2005 (**SDF10**)

Mentoring and Induction Program Every three years, beginning in 2006 (**TQ9**)*

Title III (Language Instruction for LEP Students) Every two years, beginning in 2006 (**LEP3**)*
 Talented and Gifted Program Every five years, beginning in 2007 (**GT2**)
 Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs) Every five years, beginning in 2007 (**PERK2, PERK3**)*
 At-risk Program Every five years, beginning in 2008 (**AR4**)*
 Special Education Programs and Services Every five years, beginning in 2008 (**ESPE1, ESPE2**)*

The district will collect formative evaluation data for each program on an annual basis. However, the district will collect data regarding some programs, such as the professional development program (district career development plan), more frequently. Progress toward meeting program/service expectations will be reported to the District Leadership Team, the Board of Education, and the SIAC.

B. What implementation/student data will we collect, analyze, and use to determine how well each program/service described in Question 2 has been implemented to support our CSIP goals? B. What implementation/student data will we collect, analyze, and use to determine how well each program/service described in Constant Conversation Question #2 (What do/will we do to meet student learning needs?) has been implemented to support our CSIP goals?

CSIP Indicator Data to Measure Program Effectiveness

The district will evaluate the effectiveness of the majority of its instructional programs and services, at least partially, through examination of the indicator data, disaggregated by program participants, for each of the goals listed in its CSIP Constant Conversation Question #2. Based on input from the program providers, Building Leadership Teams, and District Leadership Team, the district decided that evaluation of these data would be sufficient, at this time, to assist in determining the effectiveness of the following programs:

- Professional Development Program (district career development plan) (**TQ11**)
- At-Risk Program (**AR4**)
- Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs) (**PERK2, PERK3**)
- Mentoring and Induction Program (**TQ9**)
- Special Education Programs and Services (**ESPE2**)
- Title I, Part A (Parental Involvement Program) (**TITL1**)
- Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Program) (**TPTR1**)
- Title II, Part D (E2T2) (**FTP6**)
- Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students Program) (**LEP3**)
- Title IV (Safe and Drug Free Schools) (**SDF10**)

Additional Indicator Data to Measure Program Effectiveness

The district decided that it needs additional information to determine the effectiveness of some of its programs. In addition to the indicator data associated with the CSIP goals listed in the district's Constant Conversation #2, the district will also collect, analyze, and use the following data to inform effectiveness with the following programs:

Professional Development Program and Title II, Part A (**TQ10, TQ11, TQ12, TPTR1**)

- Percentage of faculty responsible for instruction who participate in district and building career development opportunities
- Percentage of K-12 teachers who accurately use the strategies as measured by observations and implementation logs
- Percentage of K-12 teachers who document technology usage in their implementation logs
- Percentage of K-3 students who are independent at grade level on the QR III
- Percentage of 6-8 students who improve on Every Student Counts performance task
- Percentage of students who meet credentialing standards in reading and mathematics 6-12

Gifted and Talented Program (GT2)

Rather than judging the effectiveness of its gifted and talented program through CSIP goal indicators the district is going to use the following indicator to determine the effectiveness of its gifted and talented program:

- Percentage of all students participating in the gifted and talented program who meet goals in their individualized learning plans

Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs (PERK2, PERK3)

- Percentage of students by special population subgroups in career and technical programs who are proficient in occupational skills
- Percentage of graduates by special population who were program concentrators who receive a high school diploma or equivalent
- Percentage of senior program completers by subgroups who participate in career and technical programs who indicate their intention to continue their education, non-military employment, or military employment

Mentoring and Induction Program (TQ9)

- Percentage of beginning teachers participating in the mentoring and induction program who meet goals of the district career development plan, as appropriate to their teaching assignment
- Percentage of beginning teachers participating in the mentoring and induction program who demonstrate competency in classroom management skills

Special Education Programs and Services (ESPE1)

- Percentage of all students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who meet their IEP goals

Title I, Part A, Parental Involvement (TITL1)

- Percentage of parents who participate in the annual evaluation of the parental involvement policy in improving the academic quality of schools served under Title 1, Part A

Title III (LEP3)

- Percentage of ELL students who are proficient in English

District Information

Authorized Agency	Denison Comm School District 819 N 16th St Denison, Iowa 51442 AEA: AEA 12 Northwest AEA (district filed under aea code 12)
CSIP Coordinator	Name: Michael Pardun Title: Superintendent Telephone: 712 - 263 - 2176 Extension: FAX: 712 - 263 - 5233

Email: mpardun@denison.k12.ia.us

Certified Dates

District: [9/3/2004 4:07:55 PM](#)

Readers: [11/14/2004 6:35:14 PM](#)

State: [2/7/2005 12:09:17 PM](#)

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

Current Date and Time: 2/8/2007 12:30:08 PM

(REFRESHING WEB PAGE UPDATES DATE AND TIME)