Iowa Department of Education

School Year: 2005-2006 Go	Form: Print Summary Go Exit
	District: **3645** Name: **Lewis Central Comm School District**

Division of PK-12 Education

Annual Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

Print Summary 2005-2006

This School Year's Records Are for Browsing, Only

(No updates/additions/deletions can be made to this web form.)

Five-Year Site Visit 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 year to be modified, see the bottom of a future year's Status form for this utility.

CSIP answers have been started for a newer school year, this year's answers can no longer be changed or certified.

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan Select Form

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

All Select CSIP Question

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

A. What data do we collect? Among the data we collect are the following (**LRDA1**, **LRDA2**, **LRDA3**, **LRDA4**):

- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED reading and mathematics at grades 3-9, and 11
- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED science for grades 3-9, and 11
- Trend line and subgroup data for PLAN reading, mathematics and science at grade 10
- Trend line and subgroup data for NWEA MAP in reading comprehension and mathematics at grades 2-8 (Fall and Spring for grades 6-8 and Fall, Winter and Spring for grades 2-5)
- Trend line and subgroup data for NWEA MAP in reading comprehension for Special education and ELL students at grades 9-12. (Fall, Winter and Spring)
- English proficiency for all ELL students via the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT)
- 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 vocation education student data for Perkins (11th grade participants' proficiency in reading and mathematics, program completers, and occupational competency)
- Percentage of high school students achieving a score or status on the ACT indicating probable postsecondary success.

- Trend line data from the Iowa Youth Survey (grades 6, 8, and 11) (**SDF1**, **SDF2**, **SDF3**)
- Data from the district developed science assessments (grades 3-8 and all science courses at the high school)
- Data from the district developed social studies assessments (grades 3-8 and all social studies courses at the high school)
- Participation rates for required district-wide assessments (grades 3-11)
- Phonemic Awareness (grade K)
- Marie Clay Observation Survey (grades K-1)
- Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literary Skills (DIBELS) data (grades K-1)
- Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) data (grades 1-3)
- District-developed benchmark assessments in math, science and social studies (grades K-2)
- Curriculum-Based Measures (CBM) data (grades 3-5)
- Quality Schools Survey - A comprehensive, community-wide needs assessment (completed at least once every five-years) (**LC3**)
- Climate surveys (CRESST at the Middle School and teacher-developed surveys at the high school)
- Parent and community opinions via parent network meetings at individual buildings and the Community Communication Group
- Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) data (e.g., course offerings and enrollment information by course/gender)
- District demographic data
- Aggregate and subgroup attendance data (grades K-12)
- Student work/course grades (grades 3-12)
- Student discipline data (e.g., office referrals, suspensions, and expulsions) (grades K-12)
- Student participation in the district's breakfast and lunch program (grades K-12)
- One and five year graduate follow-up surveys

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

The Administrative Team consists of the Superintendent, School Improvement Specialist, Coordinator of Special Populations, Business Manager, Director of Operations, all Principals, Assistant Principals, Instructional Strategists and an AEA 13 Regional Administrator. This group meets twice per month to collect and analyze district-level data and monitor implementation toward district goals.

The Instructional Council meets six times per year. The team is comprised of general education and special education teachers from each building, the principals, the instructional strategists, the school improvement specialist and the superintendent. This group reviews information from Building Leadership Teams and shares district-level data. In addition, information regarding the implementation of actions and activities to support current district goals at each building are shared. The Instructional Council ensures that the action plans designed to meet district goals are communicated and understood at all levels within the district. Implementation data on action plans are also shared the Instructional Council by the Building Leadership Teams. These data, along with implementation data from state and federal programs and services, are incorporated into annual conversations about supports for established student needs, adjustments to actions, programs and services, and progress toward district goals.)

The Curriculum Facilitators (seven teachers, School Improvement Specialist and AEA School Improvement Specialist) meet monthly as a group to plan curriculum and assessment development activities for teachers. They are responsible for the design and articulation of curriculum and assessment within the district. They facilitate monthly curriculum committee meetings where teachers analyze data (pre- and post- district made tests, ITBS/ITED item analyses, ITAP analyses, etc.) and revise or develop curriculum on a cycle. They also coordinate the selection and adoption of instructional materials.

Building Leadership Teams

Each building in the district has at least one Building Leadership Team whose responsibility is to collect and analyze data related to its level. Each group is responsible for monitoring the implementation of specific initiatives within the buildings as well as monitoring student achievement data. The leadership teams consist of the principal, the instructional strategist, AEA technical support, counselors and teachers. The leadership teams meet at least monthly at which time they analyze implementation data and student achievement data. Data is analyzed by working through a four-question process: 1) What do you notice in the data?; 2) What additional questions does the data generate?; 3) What implications do the results have for instructional practice and staff development?; and 4) What can we infer teachers need to work on? This information is then shared and discussed with the rest of the building staff during staff meetings and early release days. Building Leadership Teams annually present building plans and results to the School Board.

Stakeholder Groups

District and building information is shared with various stakeholder groups, including the School Board, School Improvement Advisory Committee, TAG Advisory Committee, Preschool Advisory Committee, At-Risk Advisory Committee, Special Education Advisory, Community Conversation Group, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), district patrons, and various community organizations.

The School Improvement Advisory Committee studies and discusses data from the Building Leadership Cadres and summarizes the findings. The School Improvement Advisory Committee through the School Improvement Specialist then makes recommendations to the board regarding district-wide prioritized needs, possible adjustments to goals, programs and services provided to students. The school board makes decisions based on these recommendations.

C. What did we learn through this data analysis? Reading (**LRDA1**, **LRDA2**, **LRDA3**, **LRDA4**)

ITBS/ITED reading trends are up for achievement in fourth and sixth grade and down slightly for grades 8 and 11. Scores are below state averages at grades 4 and 8 and above state averages at grade 11.

The Fall 2005 percentage of Low SES 3rd-5th graders proficient or better in reading was 50.55%. This puts LC on the Watch List for our two elementary buildings.

The Fall 2005 percentage of Low SES 6th-8th graders proficient or better in reading was 36.84%. This puts LC Middle School on the SINA for reading.

The percentage of Low SES 4th and 8th graders considered proficient for 2002-2004 is lower than the percentage of students considered proficient for 2001-2003 in the AEA 13 region and the state as a whole. This trend is also seen for other sub-groups, most notably males and students with IEPs.

The percentage of Low SES 11th graders considered proficient for 2002-2004 is higher than the percentage of students who were considered proficient for 2001-2003 in the AEA 13 region and the state as a whole.

When comparing annual average percentile rank for cohort groups (i.e., 4th grade fall 2002 to 5th grade Fall 2003), in every case there was an increase in average percentile rank for the cohort group.

Average gain in RIT scores for reading comprehension on the NWEA MAP assessment

increased in grades 3-8 for FY05 and FY06.

Reading comprehension as measured by the PLAN test in 10th grade has increased slightly over the last four years (74.1% proficient Fall 2003).

83% of all 3rd graders read at a level of 38 or higher on DRA during the Spring administration (at grade level) with 56% of all 3rd grade students reading at a level of 44 (maximum level possible).

DRA results for 1st graders show that 58% of the students met or exceeded the expected reading level. 71% of 2nd graders met or exceeded the proficient level in reading.

Rigby Benchmark testing (Spring 2004) indicated that 79% of kindergarteners met or exceeded the proficiency level. This is a decline in students at or above proficiency from the previous three years.

Mathematics (**LRDA1**, **LRDA2**, **LRDA3**, **LRDA4**)

ITBS/ITED math trends are up slightly in 4th and 6th and down slightly for grade 8 and 11. Scores are below state averages at grades 4, 6 and 8 and above state averages at grade 11.

The Fall 2005 percentage of Low SES 3rd-5th graders proficient or better in math was 42.31%. This puts LC on the Watch List for our two elementary buildings.

The Fall 2005 percentage of Low SES 6th-8th graders proficient or better in reading was 42.11%. The gains from the previous year means that LC Middle School met AYP with Safe Harbor applied. LCMS is a SINA school for math.

The percentage of Low SES 4th and 8th graders considered proficient for 2002-2004 is lower than the percentage of students considered proficient for 2001-2003 in the AEA 13 region and the state as a whole. This trend is also seen for other sub-groups, most notably males and students with IEPs.

When comparing annual average percentile rank for cohort groups (i.e., 4th grade fall 2002 to 5th grade Fall 2003), in every case there was an increase in average percentile rank for the cohort group.

All grade except 6th had more than one year expected growth in RIT scores for math on the NWEA MAP assessment Fall 2005 to Spring 2006.

Mathematics total as measured by the PLAN test in 10th grade has increased slightly for the last three years (81.4% proficient Fall 2005).

66% of 1st graders and 69% of kindergarteners mastered math concepts as measured by district developed math assessments.

ACT trends show LC above state and national averages in all areas except math.

Science (**LRDA1**, **LRDA2**, **LRDA3**, **LRDA4**)

ITBS/ITED trends for all students have increased at the 4th grade but have declined at the 8th and 11th grade.

The percentage of 8th graders scoring proficient in Fall 2005 (61.6%) was below the state and above the national average.

The percentage of 11th graders scoring proficient in declined each of the past 3 years (71.7% in

Fall 2005).

Differences between low SES and non-low SES students were pronounced at all grades (i.e. 8th grade low SES 44.4% proficient vs. non-low SES 72.5% proficient, 11th grade low SES 50.0% proficient vs. non-low SES 77.8% proficient).

Science as measured by the PLAN test in 10th grade has decreased slightly for the last three years (74.6% proficient Fall 2003).

Other Indicators (**LRDA1**, **LRDA2**, **LRDA3**, **LRDA4**)

The LC graduation rate has increased steadily for the past five years but remain below the state average.

The K-8 Average Daily Attendance rate increased for the third year in a row to 95.40% in 2005.

In 2005-06, 44.5% of the graduating seniors completed a core program, yet 82.7% of the graduating class plan to continue education beyond high school.

We saw an overall reduction in substance use prevalence rates on the Iowa Youth Survey from 1999 to 2005 in tobacco (from 21% currently using to 12%), alcohol (from 26% currently using to 20%) and drugs (from 14% currently using to 12%). (Healthy Youth domain and substance use constructs) (**SDF1**, **SDF2**, **SDF3**, **SDF4**)

In 2002, 40% of 11th graders reported currently using alcohol (nearly double the AEA and state averages).

Students reporting that they agree that violence is the worst way to solve problems increased from 80% to 91% from 1999 to 2002. (Socially Competent Youth domain and Positive Values construct)

11th graders reporting that other students treat them with respect increased from 32% in 1999 to 52% in 2002.

In 2002, 63% of the 6th graders reported that other students treat them with respect compared to 33% of the 8th graders.

In Spring of 2000, the district conducted a community-wide needs assessment survey from the New Iowa Schools receiving completed surveys from 523 parents, 145 staff members and 988 students. This was the second time the district had used this survey. The highest issue of concern for all parents regardless of level was “school climate”. Middle school students and teachers both felt that “school climate” was a concern. Although other issues were measured through this survey, climate surfaced as the primary priority. (**LC3**)

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**):

- Improve reading comprehension for all students, especially low SES and IEP students at all grades
- Improve mathematics performance for all students
- Improve science performance for all students
- Create a positive and respectful climate to enhance the learning environment in our district
- Improve district graduation rate

E. How will we develop goals and actions based upon the prioritized needs? The building leadership teams in collaboration with community stakeholders as appropriate will review the data, develop goals, and design plans of action to address the prioritized student needs. These plans will be reviewed by the district leadership teams (Administrative Team, Instructional Council, School Improvement Advisory Committee and Curriculum facilitators as appropriate) and recommended to the Board for adoption.

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

A. What long-range goals have been established to support prioritized student needs? Based upon recommendations from the District Leadership teams, the Board has adopted district goals aligned with student needs. These student learning goals will be re-visited through the School Improvement Advisory Committee and the needs assessment survey. (**LC5**)

District Student Learning Goals

Students graduating from Lewis Central Community School District will be able to do the following (**LC6**):

- Read to understand and interpret information and for enjoyment.
- Write to communicate ideas and convey information to an audience.
- Adapt and apply listening and speaking skills to given situations.
- Use math skills to solve real-world problems.
- Access and use sources of information to solve problems and make decisions independently and as a member of a team.
- Apply scientific concepts to understand self, world and universe.
- Use technology to support learning and enhance daily living in a rapidly changing world.
- Know and apply principles of democracy to be productive citizens.
- Understand the concepts and benefits of healthy living.
- Demonstrate job-seeking and job-keeping skills.
- Experience and develop an awareness of the arts.

District Long-Range Goals

Goal 1: All K-12 students will achieve at high levels in reading comprehension, prepared for success beyond high school. (**LRG1**, **MCGF3**, **AR6**, **EIG1**)

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 1:
1a. Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (41st percentile or above using national norms) on the ITBS Reading Comprehension Test in grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Reading Comprehension Test in grade 11, including data disaggregated by subgroup.
1b. Percentage of students in grades 1-3 who are independent readers at grade level on the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA).
1c. Percentage of students in kindergarten reading at the proficient level or above on Rigby Benchmark testing.
1d. Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (using local cut scores) on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Reading Comprehension Test in grades 2 through 8, including data disaggregated by subgroup.

Goal 2: All K-12 students will achieve at high levels in mathematics, prepared for success beyond high school. (**LRG2**, **MCGF3**, **AR6**, **EIG1**)

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 2:
2a. Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (41st percentile or above

using national norms) on the ITBS Mathematics Total Test in grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Mathematics Test in grade 11, including data disaggregated by subgroup.
2b. Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (using local cut scores) on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Mathematics Test in grades 2 through 8, including data disaggregated by subgroup.
2c. Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (41st percentile or above using national norms) on the PLAN Test in grade 10.

Goal 3: All K-12 students will achieve at high levels in science, prepared for success beyond high school. (**LRG3**, **MCGF3**, **AR6**)

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 3:
3a. Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (41st percentile or above using national norms) on the ITBS Science Test in grades 5 and 8 and the ITED Science Test in grade 11, including data disaggregated by subgroup.
3b. Percentage of students in grades 4, 8, and 11 who achieve at the proficient level or above on the district developed science assessments.

Goal 4: All K-12 students will use technology in developing proficiency in reading, mathematics, and science. (**FTP1**)

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 4:
4a. The indicators identified for Goals 1, 2, and 3.
4b. Percentage of students at grade 8 rated at the proficient level or above after taking the required 8th grade Technical Integration of English class (TIE).

Goal 5: All students feel cared about at school and will exhibit safe, responsible, and respectful behaviors.

The following indicators will measure district progress with goal 5:
5a. Attendance rate as measured by the average daily attendance data, including data disaggregated by subgroup.
5b. Graduation rate as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education.
5c. Percentage of student body in grades 3-12 that receives any discipline referrals. (**SDF5**, **SDF6**, **SDF7**)
5d. Percentage of students in grades 6, 8, and 11 that report that they have used alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs on the Iowa Youth Survey. (**SDF5**, **SDF6**, **SDF7**).
5e. Student/staff/parent/community surveys

B. What process will be used to determine what we will do to meet the long-range goals?
Staff has worked to analyze the district and building data and identify areas of need. Building leadership teams have reviewed the data and used the information to develop staff development action plans. The Iowa Professional Development Model will be used in the planning. As actions are developed to support goals, implementation plans will be developed at the buildings and shared with the District Leadership teams to provide a PK-12 alignment of efforts.

C. What is our current practice to support these long-range goals? Instructional Strategies Currently Used in the District

Read alouds
Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)
Fluency strategies through Every Child Reads
Guided Reading
Student Led Conferences
Flexible small group instruction
Community Building/Collaborative Processing

Calendar Math
Lifeskills instruction
Re-connecting Youth Strategies
Standards-Based Instruction
Student-Involved Assessment
Background knowledge/vocabulary building

Instructional Programs/Services Supports Currently Used in the District

District Career Development Plan (Professional Development Program K-12)
At-risk Program/Services (K-12) (**AR7**)
Gifted and Talented Program/Services (TAG) (K-12)
English as a Second Language Program
Special Education Program/Services (PK-12)
Mentoring and Induction Program
Student Assistance Teams (PK-12)
Student Assistance Program (9-12)
Foster Grandparents Program (PK-5)
K-3 Innovative Grant - Reading Paraeducators (K-1)
Every Child Reads (PK-3)
Reading Recovery (1st grade)
Drop Everything and Read (6-8)
Boystown FAME Reading Program (7-12)
Conflict Manager Program (3-5)
Love and Logic Parent Education Program
Comprehensive School Reform Grant / Integrated Thematic Instruction - Kovalik and Associates (PK-5)
Foundations: Establishing Positive School-wide Discipline (6-8)
Re-connecting Youth Grant (9-12)
Capturing Kids Hearts (9-12)
Iowa Jobs for America's Graduates (I-JAG) (9-12) (**AR7**)
Technology-based reading programs – Accelerated Reader (6-8), CCC (Title I, 3-5)
Perkins: Vocational and Technical Education Programs (9-12)
Title I, Part A: Reading Program/Services (1-6)
Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program/Services

System-wide Management Supports Currently Used in the District

18 two-hour early release staff development sessions
4 full day curriculum review district days
Resource allocation (e.g., financial and personnel)
Technology (e.g., data management system and infrastructure)
Personnel evaluation systems (includes administrators, teachers, and paraeducators)
Curriculum/Assessment development cycle
Iowa Technical Adequacy Project (ITAP) (curriculum/assessment alignment)
Leadership for CSIP implementation
Curriculum and Assessment Development Processes - Curriculum Facilitators
State-Wide Reading Team participation
Professional Learning Communities implementation at all attendance centers

D. How is our current practice aligned with or supported by the research base? Lewis Central strives to endorse and implement research-based instructional strategies and practices in the classroom as much as possible. Through various programs and support systems such as the District's Staff Development Plan, Teacher Evaluation System (based on the Iowa Teaching Standards), curriculum development processes, and building action plans, research-based

practices are continuously pursued, implemented and evaluated.

Research Needed. In some cases we know the research exists (i.e. Every Child Reads, Reading Recovery, Boystown FAME, etc.) but we have not completed the study process to document the research. Building Leadership Teams will collect and review the literature base on research-based practices. Timelines will be developed within the next five years for each of the following areas of study. Other areas will be added as Building Leadership Teams choose strategies that align with goals.

Reading:
- Read alouds
- Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)
- Guided Reading (Flexible Dynamic Grouping)
- Boystown FAME reading program
- Reading Recovery
- DEAR

Math:
- Calendar Math

Technology:
- Strategies designed to enhance instruction in reading, mathematics, and science

Environment:
- Alternative high school programming (**AR7**)
- Middle school concept
- Lifeskills instruction
- Re-connecting Youth strategies
- Understanding poverty (Ruby Payne research)
- Foundations: Establishing Positive School-wide Discipline

Assessment:
- Student-led conferences
- Student-Involved Assessment

Instruction:
- Flexible small group instruction
- Integrated Thematic Instruction
- Inclusionary special services
- Community Building/Collaborative Processing
- Standards-Based Instruction
- Reciprocal teaching
- Building background knowledge/vocabulary

E. What gaps exist between our current practice to support long-range goals and the research base (include curriculum and instruction)? Instructional Strategy Decisions: In reviewing our instructional practices, it is apparent that some practices have a clearly documented research base while others do not. As the Lewis Central addresses the research base, we must address the following:

1. The discontinuation of practices that are not supported by research or have not produced evidence of contributing to positive student results such as inappropriate use of homework, inappropriate grading practices, inappropriate assessment practices, and whole class ability grouping.
2. The consistent implementation of strategies that are research-based and/or have contributed to gains in student achievement, such as differentiated instruction, student-involved assessment practices, and strong alignment between curriculum, instruction and assessment.

Curriculum/Assessment Alignment: Our district has standards and benchmarks in all content areas. The district has a curriculum review cycle. Reading and writing benchmarks have recently been revised. Science assessments are being rewritten and will be administered over the next two years to collect baseline data. Our district has used the ITAP process and has revised the curriculum revision cycle to ensure that gaps in curricular and assessment design are addressed.

Every Child Reads: We are confident that the strategies in Every Child Reads are well grounded in the literature. We have examined implementation data and found evidence that the strategies are being implemented in reading instruction. There is no gap between the research and practice. We will be combining efforts between buildings to accommodate training issues with AEA personnel and will study implementation efforts between buildings during the coming two years.

Reading Recovery: Our local program evaluation data indicated that the program is effective in moving students toward reading at grade level and sustaining that growth over time.

Mathematics Instruction: The research base in mathematics indicates that student achievement will improve if instruction is problem-centered and incorporates the use of representations. Current practice in mathematics does not reflect these strategies; as a result, these strategies will be part of our district career development plan.

Science Instruction: The research base in science indicates that student achievement will improve if instruction is inquiry-centered and incorporates hands-on instructional practices. Even though our curriculum was designed using inquiry-based thinking, implementation has not been monitored, and staff development on standards-based instruction in science has been weak at best. Current practice in science needs to be studied; as a result, selection of appropriate instructional strategies for science will be part of our district career development plan.

F. What actions/activities will we use to address prioritized needs, established goals, and any gaps between current and research-based practice? Actions for CSIP Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4

1. Continue the development and implementation of the district career development plan. (**AMN1**, **AMN2**, **IEI1**, **PERK1**, **SPED1**, **TQ7**)

Our career development plans describe efforts aligned with prioritized student needs. In reading, the target will be comprehension. In mathematics, the emphasis will be on problem solving. The selection of targets was based on student data. Teacher practices will be studied to help identify other professional development needs. (**PD6**, **TQ1**, **TQ2**)

Our intention is to have least 80% of professional development time focused on learning new content and instructional practices. (**TQ3**, **TQ4**, **FTP3**, **LEP1**)

Research-based Strategies. Building Leadership Teams will review research on strategies that have resulted in significant achievement gains. We will apply federal criteria to determine if a program/strategy has a quality research base prior to adopting or abandoning the strategy. (**PD5**, **SDF9**)

Participation. All teachers, principals and central office staff will be engaged in training. (**PERK1**, **SPED1**, **LEP1**, **TQ8**)

Professional Development Content

During the 2004-2005 school year, professional instructional staff for grades PK-3 will implement

the following:
a) Read Aloud
b) Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)
c) Technology Integration (**FTP2**, **FTP4**, **FTP5**)
d) Professional Learning Communities

Staff members for grades 4-5 are studying the Integrated Thematic Instruction Model with Kovalik and Associates. Specific strategies will be selected to target reading comprehension. Professional Learning Communities will also provide a structure for collaboration and improvement.

Staff members for grades 6-8 are studying their data and selecting strategies to target low performing low SES students in math and reading comprehension. One strategy will be developing background knowledge and vocabulary building for students. A second strategy involves changing math instruction through E2T2 involvement for teachers and implementing ALEKS (a computer adaptive student learning software package aligned to benchmarks) as supplemental math instruction for all students at the middle school. (**FTP2**, **FTP4**, **FTP5**) Professional Learning Communities will also provide a structure for collaboration and improvement.

Staff members for grades 9-12 are studying Assessment For Learning and implementing strategies that increase connection with students, parents, and community. Professional Learning Communities will also provide a structure for collaboration and improvement.

Prior to the start of each school year, staff are updated on the instructional and personal productivity technology advances made over the summer and that are available to them. Further sessions are held as needed during the school year for specific individuals and groups based on needs. (**FTP4**, **FTP5**)

All instructional paraprofessionals participate in the state certification process provided through the AEA and district.

Alignment with the Iowa Teaching Standards. These professional development actions align directly with the following Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria: (**TQ5**)

Standard #1 Demonstrates ability to enhance academic performance and support for implementation of the school district's student achievement goals (criteria 1a-1g)
Standard #2 Demonstrates competence in content knowledge (criteria 2a, 2b, and 2d)
Standard #3 Demonstrates competence in planning and preparation for instruction (criteria 3a, 3b, 3d, and 3e)
Standard #4 Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meet the multiple learning needs of students (criteria 4a, 4b, and 4f)
Standard #5 Uses multiple measures to monitor achievement (criteria 5b-5e)
Standard #7 Professional Development (criteria 7a-7d)

Professional Development Learning Opportunities. Implementation will involve: (**TQ7**)

- Common training sessions on 18 early release day meetings per year for learning opportunities (theory presentations, reading literature, discussions)
- Common training sessions on four inservice days during the school year (dialogue about curriculum alignment and implementation)
- Meetings of the building leadership teams (planning next building meeting; collecting, organizing, and analyzing data; practicing demonstrations)
- Teachers working in PLC teams weekly
- Grade level, team level and department meetings (observing demonstrations, working with data, developing lessons, reviewing theory, etc.)

Professional Development Providers. AEA consultants and Lewis Central staff will serve as providers for the district. (**TQ6**)

2. Strengthen alignment between curriculum, assessment and instruction
- Continue to review and align benchmarks and specific knowledge with courses and assessments
- Complete curriculum mapping in the areas of math and science (**AMN3**)
- Implement student performance and data organization tools
- Implement materials selection processes within the curriculum cycle
- Complete integration of all infusion areas in all curriculum documents
- Implement 3-Minute Walkthrough reflections in all PK-12 classrooms

3. Provide supports to address ELL students' achievement
- Implement annual identification and provision of appropriate services to ELL students to increase language proficiency and academic achievement
- Implement programs and support services necessary to increase language proficiency and academic achievement (**AR7**)

4. Provide supports that will address achievement for students with IEPs
- Improve collaborative teaching (team teaching) between special education and general education teachers
- Improve quality of IEP goal development

Actions for CSIP Goal 5

1. Support students and families in order to increase student participation, attendance, and graduation rate
- Increase the number/type of community adult education opportunities, including Love and Logic classes for parents
- Provide support programs for identified At-Risk, Special Education, and general education students (i.e. Student Assistance Program)
- Implement student-led conferences in all grades PK-8
- Enhance student mentoring program in grades 9-12
- Implement web-based parent access to secured student information
- Implement a success center for at-risk students at the middle school (**AR7**)

2. Create a learning environment that is safe, supportive, and conducive to learning (a culture of achievement and respect)
- Implement the Capturing Kids' Hearts program at the High School focusing on connecting with every student. (**AR7**, **SDF9**)
- Implement common area behavior expectations at Titan Hill and the Middle School (**SDF9**)
- Implement lifeskills instruction through the ITI model for all students grades PK-5 (**SDF9**)
- Implement conflict managers at Titan Hill for responding to student conflicts (**SDF9**)
- Review/revise Board policies and procedures addressing school safety, substance abuse and harassment

G. How will we support implementation of the identified actions? A yearlong meeting and staff development schedule will be developed at each building each year. There will be eighteen early dismissal dates for staff development purposes in 2004-2005. Staff will meet monthly to review and analyze data, learn new strategies and implement plans. Grade levels and departments will meet monthly to analyze data, plan instruction, and evaluate implementation of initiatives. Cross grade level teams will meet monthly to plan instruction, analyze data, and review curricular articulation. Leadership teams will meet to plan staff development and analyze data to be shared with staff and stakeholders.

We will devise implementation plans for the actions previously described for the CSIP goals. Implementation plans will address the following components:

- Clear expectations at the district, building, and classroom levels.
- Baseline data for each action, if available
- Resources to support each action including timelines, personnel, and budget (including state and federal programs support as necessary)
- Specific implementation outcomes for action steps
- Persons responsible for oversight of implementation
- Evaluation of action implementation effectiveness

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? We will use multiple data sources to determine if student learning has changed, including a combination of district assessments, standardized assessments, grade level and classroom assessments, and perceptual data. The Building Leadership Teams will ensure that data from these assessment measures are collected, analyzed and reported. The district will continue to ensure that all students enrolled at the specified grade level are included in district-wide assessments. (**DWAP1**)

Monitoring Progress with Long-Range CSIP Goals

We will monitor progress on our long-range goals through analysis of aggregated and disaggregated trend line data from the following sources:

- ITBS/ITED reading comprehension, mathematics total, and science at grades 3-9, and 11
- PLAN reading comprehension, mathematics, and science tests at grade 10. (Goals 1-3)
- NWEA reading and math assessments at grades 3-8 (Goals 1-2)
- Developmental Reading Assessment at grades 1-3 (Goal 1)
- Curriculum Based Measures in reading and math at grades 3-5 (Goals 1-2)
- District Developed Technology Assessment at grade 8 (Goal 4)
- District Developed benchmark assessments in Science (Goal 3)
- Attendance, discipline and drop-out data (Goal 5)
- District graduation data as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education (Goal 5)
- The percentage of the students in grades 6, 8, and 11 that reports having used alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs as reported through the Iowa Youth Survey (Goal 5)

Program Action Plans are Linked to Student Achievement Data
The student achievement data listed above are also used to monitor and measure progress and effectiveness of the following programs and services:

- Professional development for teachers and principals (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)
- Programs and services to assist English Language Learners (Title III, Part A)
- Drug and violence prevention program (Title IV, Part A)
- Early Intervention program for grades K-3
- K-12 At-Risk program
- K-12 Gifted and Talented (TAG) program
- Special education services
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs

Additional Data Gathering and Analysis
LC also collects, analyzes and reports data in the following areas:

- All data points included in the district's Annual Progress Report (APR)
- The percentage of students who participate in district-wide assessment

- The percentage of students in the lowest (at-risk or deficit) category on DIBELS in grades K-2. (**DWAP3**, **DWAP4**, **DWAP6**)
- Annual cohort performance from grade 3 through grade 11 as measured by the ITBS and ITED in the areas of reading, mathematics, science.
- Annual cohort performance and growth gains from grade 3 through grade 8 as measured by the NWEA Reading and Math assessments.
- Career and technical education student data from the end-of-year program report (Perkins report)
- The percentage of students indicating a safe learning environment and that other students treat them with respect as reported through the Iowa Youth Survey
- IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) for English Language Learners to measure ELL students' English proficiency (**LEP2**, **LEP3**)
- Community Needs Assessment Surveys (every 5 years)
- One and five year graduate surveys

As per the district assessment plan, the following district-wide assessments are administered (**DWAP1**, **DWAP6**, **DWAP7**, **DWAP8**):

- Grade PK – Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS), Getting Ready to Read
- Grade K – Phonemic Awareness, Marie Clay Observation Survey, Text Reading (Benchmark Books), Sight Words, Math Benchmarks, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks
- Grade 1 – DIBELS, Marie Clay Observation Survey, Text Reading (DRA), Sight Words, Math Benchmarks, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks
- Grade 2 – Text Reading (DRA), Sight Word Phrases, NWEA MAP in Reading and Math, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks
- Grade 3 – ITBS, Text Reading (DRA), Sight Words, CBM, NWEA MAP in Reading and Math, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks
- Grade 4 – ITBS, CBM, NWEA MAP in Reading and Math, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks
- Grade 5 – ITBS, CBM, NWEA MAP in Reading and Math, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks
- Grade 6 – ITBS, NWEA MAP in Reading and Math, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks, Iowa Youth Survey
- Grade 7 – ITBS, NWEA MAP in Reading and Math, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks
- Grade 8 – ITBS, NWEA MAP in Reading and Math, Science Benchmarks, Social Studies Benchmarks, Iowa Youth Survey
- Grade 9 – ITED, Course Benchmark Assessments
- Grade 10 – ITED, PLAN, Course Benchmark Assessments
- Grade 11 – ITED, ACT (optional), Iowa Youth Survey, Course Benchmark Assessments
- Grade 12 – ITED, ACT (optional), Course Benchmark Assessments

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? LC will use a goal-oriented approach to formally evaluate the programs and services it offers to meet student needs as identified in the CSIP. (**ECSIP1**) This approach includes the following components:

- Identification of programs that contribute to progress with the CSIP goals.
- Identification of any additional program goals.
- Identification of specific indicators of success as measured by student achievement data (**ECSIP1**)
- Development of procedures for collecting information about performance.
- Collection of performance data.

- Comparison of data with expected program goals.
- Communication of results to appropriate audiences.
- Adjustment of programs and services as appropriate based upon evaluation.

Program Evaluation Schedule

- Annually, District Career Development Plan (TQ1**0**, TQ1**1**)
- Annually, Title II, Part A (**TPTR1**)
- Annually, Title I, Part A (**TITL1**)
- Every five years, beginning with the 2005-06 school year, Talented and Gifted (**GT2**)
- Annually, beginning with the 2005-06 school year, Title II, Part D (E2T2 and **FTP6**)
- Every three years, beginning with the 2005-06 school year, Title IV – Safe and Drug Free Schools (SDF1**0**)
- Every two years, beginning with the 2005-06 school year, Title III – Language Instruction for ELL students (**LEP3**)
- Every five years, beginning with the 2006-07 school year, Early Intervention Program
- Every five years, beginning with the 2006-07 school year, At-Risk Program (**AR4**)
- Annually, beginning with the 2006-07 school year, Mentoring and Induction Program (**TQ9**)
- Every five years, beginning with the 2007-08 school year, Perkins Vocational Career and Technical Education Programs (**PERK2**, **PERK3**)
- Every five years, beginning with the 2008-09 school year, Special Education Programs and Services (**ESPE1**, **ESPE2**)

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? Input from program providers, stakeholders, administrators, teachers, parents, and students provide the forum upon which the effectiveness of the programs are determined. Specific data sources for the programs are as follows:

District Career Development Plan (TQ1**0**, TQ1**1**, TQ1**2**)

- Percent proficient, grade level equivalents and percentile ranks of whole grade and sub-group data from ITBS/ITED in math, reading and science
- Whole grade and sub-group data from NWEA MAP in math and reading
- Implementation data gathered by Building Leadership Teams
- Benchmark assessment data in reading, math and science

Title I, Part A

- Percentage of Title I students proficient in reading comprehension (ITBS and MAP)
- Percent of Title I students reading at least at grade level (DRA, Benchmark Books)
- Parent attendance at Title I Family nights (**TITL1**)
- Year-end parent surveys of Title I programs (**TITL1**)

Perkins Vocational Education (**PERK2**, PERK 3)

- Percentage of program students proficient in mathematics
- Percentage of program students proficient in reading
- Percentage of program students proficient in occupational skills
- Percentage of program completers
- Percentage of program completers receiving a high school diploma
- Percentage of program completers continuing in education, military and employment
- Percentage of program students in non-traditional gender programs
- Percentage of program completers in non-traditional gender programs

Title II, Part A (Teacher Training/Recruiting/Class Size)

- ITBS/ITED Reading Comprehension student achievement data

- ITBS/ITED Mathematics student achievement data
- EEO data on first and second year teachers (**TPTR1**)
- Data from the Teacher Mentoring and Induction Program
- Class size trends (K-3)

Title II, Part D (Technology)
- Student achievement data on Technology Literacy Standards in 8th grade (**FTP6**)

Title III (Language Instruction for LEP Students) (**LEP3**, **LEP2**)
- ESL student performance on IPT test
- ESL student performance on MAP assessments in reading and math
- ESL student grades
- ESL student drop-out rate
- Annual enrollment data of ESL student population
- ITBS/ITED data of LEP students

Title IV (Safe and Drug Free Schools) (SDF1**0**)
- Iowa Youth Survey (Questions 12, 21-30, 39, 43-53)
- Student discipline referrals related to substance abuse, bullying, harassment and violence

Early Childhood Program
- Annual growth trends for reading and math on MAP assessments
- Percentage of students reading at least on Grade-Level
- Grade 3 ITBS Reading Comprehension student achievement data

Teacher Mentoring and Induction Program (**TQ9**)
- Individual Teacher Comprehensive Evaluations
- Teacher Retention
- Assessments, Reflections, Evaluations
- Percent of beginning teachers completing the Mentoring and Induction Program who obtain a Standard Teaching License

Gifted and Talented Program (**GT2**)
- Percentage of identified G & T students who have Personalized Education Plan
- Percentage of G & T students that have met the goals of their Personalized Education Plan

At-Risk Program (**AR4**)
- Enrollment of At-Risk students
- Percentage of program students who are proficient in mathematics (ITBS/ITED)
- Percentage of program students who are proficient in reading (ITBS/ITED)
- Percent of program students receiving discipline referrals
- Attendance of program students
- Grades of program students
- Graduation rate of program students
- Parent participation in Love and Logic Workshops

Special Education Program (**ESPE1**, **ESPE2**)
- Percentage of program students attaining IEP goals
- Enrollment of program students in courses
- Percentage of program students who are proficient in mathematics (ITBS/ITED)
- Percentage of program students who are proficient in reading (ITBS/ITED)
- IEP monitoring
- Program student achievement data on district assessments

District Information	
Authorized Agency	**Lewis Central Comm School District** **1600 E S Omaha Brdg Rd** **Council Bluffs, Iowa 51503** AEA: AEA 13 Green Hills (district filed under aea control code 9213) School Improvement Consultant for this AEA: **brandie.gean@iowa.gov ,** **515-281-4726**
CSIP Coordinator	Name: **David Black** Title: **School Improvement Specialist** Telephone: **712 - 366 - 8203** Extension: FAX: **712 - 366 - 8315** Email: **dblack@lewiscentral.k12.ia.us**
Year Site Visit Scheduled	**2005**
Certified Dates	District: 9/21/2006 7:18:19 AM Readers: 9/29/2006 2:40:06 PM State: 9/29/2006 2:40:11 PM

Annual Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

Current Date and Time: 6/1/2012 2:46:46 PM

(REFRESHING WEB PAGE UPDATES DATE AND TIME)