Denver Community School
Comprehensive School Improvement Plan
2010-2014 (Developed 9/2010)

The Denver Community School District serves approximately 760 students and is made up of two elementary schools (K-2, 3-5), one middle school (6-8) and one high school (9-12). Enrollment has remained stable the past few years and this trend is expected to continue. 99% of the district's students are white, approximately **12%** are on free and reduced lunch, and **16%** receive special education services. The District has worked with neighboring districts for many years and currently shares secondary academic classes and/or athletics with two neighboring districts.
The community has been extremely supportive of the school district. The district is currently in the process of adding on a new elementary addition to the current 3-12 school site. Starting in the fall of 2011, all students will be attending school at one location which will be beneficial to all.

Question 1: What do data tell us about our student learning needs?

Part 1A: What data do we collect?

Denver collects the following required data and reports it annually in our APR(LRDA1). In addition to grade-level trends, the District also uses National Percentile Rank (NPR) information from the ITBS/ITED assessments to monitor the progress of cohort groups over time in reading comprehension, math, science, language and social studies.

- Participation rates for required district-wide assessments for Grades, 4, 8 and 11.
- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED Reading and Mathematics for Grades 4, 8, and 11
- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED Science for Grades 8 and 11
- Data from Northwest Evaluation Association Measure of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) testing for Reading, Math and Science at Grades 2-10.
- Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) data for Grades K, 1, and 2 beginning in the Fall of 2009.
- Observation Survey/Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA2) for Grades K, 1, and 2 beginning in the Fall of 2009.
- Informal Reading Inventories (IRI) for Grades 3, 4, and 5 beginning in Fall of 2010.
- Graduation rate
- Grade 7-12 Dropout percentages (aggregate and by subgroup)
- Percentage of graduates planning to pursue postsecondary education
- Percentage of graduates completing and core curriculum (4 years of English, 3 years of each of mathematics, science, and social studies

- Percentage of high school students achieving an ACT score indicating probable post secondary success
- Career and technical education (CTE) student data (e.g. program completers) (PERK1)
- Trend line data from the Iowa Youth Survey at Grades 6, 8 and 11 (SDF1, SDF2, and SDF3)
- Trend line data from the Building Tomorrow: Culture & Climate Partnership Survey at Grades 4-12 (SDF1, SDF3, and SDF4)
- Average daily attendance for Grades K-12 (by buildings and district)
- A comprehensive, community-wide needs assessment, which includes input from community, parents, administrators, staff, and students (completed once every five-years) (LC3)
- District Technology Assessment at Grade 8

The Denver Community School District believes that the required measures of academic achievement above do not provide a complete picture of its students' learning needs. In support of this belief, the district also collects and analyzes data from several other sources to use in its evaluation of both individual students and the school as a whole. These include:

- ITBS/ITED data from other grade levels and subject areas (Grades 3-8, 9 & 11)
- NWEA MAP data from other grades levels and subject areas (Grades 2-11)
- PLAN (Pre-ACT) data (Grade 10)
- District demographic data
- Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) data
- Student discipline data (office referrals, suspensions and expulsions) in grades K-12 (SDF1, SDF3)
- Student participation in extra curricular activities in grades 7-12
- Student referrals to General Education Intervention (G.E.I.) in grades K-12
- Reading Counts (Grades 6-9)

Part 1B:

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

The district has undertaken several initiatives relative to the collection and analysis of data and involving the community in using the data to set improvement goals. An overview of these efforts follows. In addition, each Goal Action Plan begins with a description of the findings from data that were used to set long-ranged and annual improvement goals and to aid in the selection of strategies to be used to reach those goals. Methods for the collection and analysis of the data include:

- Development of a "District Wide Assessment Plan" that outlines the timing, purpose, audience, and content of district wide assessments that will be used to measure student progress. The assessments are explained in the district's Annual Progress Report.
- Test result analysis-during staff development and throughout our collaborative teaming (PLCs). Administrators help teachers learn how to analyze and use both formative and summative

test data to make instructional decisions. This has been and will continue to be part of the district's staff development program over the next several years.

- Building-level teams and District-level teams, as well as the Comprehensive School Improvement Team, annually review student achievement data in reading, math, and science in order to develop annual improvement goals that relate to the district's long range Annual Yearly Progress long-range goal.
- The Comprehensive School Improvement Team examine district and building data in order to provide recommendations to the board relative to the long-range and annual improvement goals of the district.
- The Comprehensive School Improvement Team annually reviews evidence of student learning on the district's annual and long-range goals and provides input on focus and direction. These meetings also serve as a way to educate the public about new testing programs used to measure student progress.
- Several types of student achievement data are reported to the public in the Annual Progress Report.

Part 1C:
What did we learn through this data analysis?

Below is a summary of the key finding from Denver's analysis of data that were collected from the sources listed in Section 1A. (LRDA1, LRDA2, LRDA3, and LRDA4)

- One hundred percent of our students participated in all district-wide assessments (Grades 3-11)
- The majority of proficiency percentiles on the ITBS and ITED assessments showed little growth (flat lined) in reading, mathematics and science but remain at high levels. (Grades 3-11)
- The percent of students proficient in Reading Comprehension, Math, and Science is consistently above 85%.
- The percent of students proficient in Reading Comprehension dropped considerably for the 6th grade class in Fall 2009, in comparison to their 5th grade class proficiency rate.
- Our 7th grade class in the Fall 2009 performed in the top 7% in all ITBS testing areas in both the National and State Rankings.
- The percent of students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) proficient in Reading Comprehension is consistently lower than the district's overall percentage.
- The majority of the grade levels performed at or above the specified NWEA target goal rate on the NWEA MAP (Measures of Academic Progress) scores for the Spring 2010 tests.
- District graduation rates are consistently above the state average.
- 100% of the students graduating from Denver High School complete the core standards (4 years of English and 3 years of each of mathematics, science, and social studies)
- In 2010, about one-third of the secondary students indicated that students in this school treat students with little kindness or respect on the *Building Tomorrow: Culture & Climate Partnership Survey* (SDF1, SDF4).
- In 2010, 35% of the secondary students indicated that they have tried alcohol on the Building Tomorrow: Culture & Climate Partnership Survey (SDF2, SDF3).
- District attendance rates are consistently at or above the state average.

In April, 2009 a Community Survey was distributed and offered over the Internet to community members and parents. 222 individuals completed surveys. The analysis of the data yielded the following information (LC3):

- 98.6% of the respondents indicated that they have internet access.
- 89.6% of the respondents on the elementary portion of the survey indicated that they feel that their children are safe going to and from school.
- 97.8% of the respondents on the middle school portion of the survey indicated that they are very satisfied on how their children are performing in math.
- 92.3% of the respondents on the high school survey indicated that they are satisfied with the communication of how their children are performing.

Part 1D:
From the data analysis, what are our prioritized needs? (LC4)

Based on the district data analysis, we have found the following prioritized needs:

- Improve student performance in reading comprehension for the 2010-11 7th graders
- Improve student behaviors in regards to treating others with respect
- Improve class performance levels in areas of the NWEA MAP test
- Implement curriculum to inform students about the importance of making good choices regarding health, drugs, and alcohol

Part 1E:

How will we develop goals and actions based upon the prioritized needs?

The District Teacher Quality Committee (formerly the District Leadership Team) and the Comprehensive School Improvement Team will use the prioritized needs to generate and recommend goals to the Board for adoption. The District and Building level leadership teams will plan actions that align with and support each of the goals.

Question 2 - What do/will we do to meet student learning needs?

Part 2A:

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

In support of the Iowa Department of Education adoption of the Iowa Core Curriculum, the Denver Community School District has made a long-term commitment of adopting and implementing the defined curriculum and related components of the ICC plan. An overview of the plan was presented by the district's Iowa Core Curriculum Leadership Team to various stakeholders including the Comprehensive School Improvement Team Advisory Committee (LC5), K-12 staff members, community members, and the Denver Board of Education. During these presentations, the Iowa Core Curriculum Plan was reviewed, discussed, and defined. One main identified component of the plan was that of the 21st Century Skills. The Denver

Community School District stakeholders have made a long-range goal commitment by adopting these skills as required graduation requirements. The following is a defined copy of the 21st Century Skills as identified:

21st Century Skills

Each Iowa student must graduate with the 21st century skills necessary for a productive and satisfying life in a global knowledge-based environment. Descriptions of the new global reality are plentiful, and the need for new, 21st century skills in an increasingly complex environment is well documented. In one form or another, authors cite (1) the globalization of economics; (2) the explosion of scientific and technological knowledge; (3) the increasingly international dimensions of the issues we face, (i.e. global warming and pandemic diseases); and (4) changing demographics as the major trends that have resulted in a future world much different from the one that many of us faced when we graduated from high school (Friedman, 2005 and Stewart, 2007). The trends are very clear that each Iowa student will need essential 21st century skills to lead satisfying lives in this current reality.

As Ken Kay, president of the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, stated, the 21st century skills set "is the ticket to economic upward mobility in the new economy" (Gewertz, 2007). Our world economy has evolved from an industrial era to an information era and is now on the way to the creativity era, while at the same time our schools are stagnant in the industrial model. The 21st century skills are key elements in supporting our youth not only in surviving but excelling in the new global environment.

"It is a world in which comfort with ideas and abstractions is the passport to a good job, in which creativity and innovation are the keys to the good life, in which high levels of education – a very different kind of education than most of us have had – are going to be the only security there is."- *New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, 2006*

The Framework for 21st Century Learning stated, "We believe schools must move beyond a focus on basic competency in core subjects to promoting understanding of academic content at much higher levels by weaving 21st century interdisciplinary themes into core subjects" (2007). 21st century skills bridge the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of students from the core academic areas to real life applications. Robert Sternberg described the necessity for 21st century skills when he stated, "…When we teach only for facts, rather than for how to go beyond facts, we teach students how to get out of date… " (2008).

Descriptions of what constitute essential 21st century skills are plentiful as well. In the 2007 legislative session, the Iowa Legislature established the Iowa 21st century skills framework as
(1) employability skills
(2) financial literacy
(3) health literacy
(4) technology literacy
(5) civic literacy

Within this 21st century skill framework we must identify common strands, or learning skills that will allow students to thrive in the world of work and to be productive citizens. Tony Wagner, Harvard Graduate School of Education, labels these "survival skills" as (1) critical thinking and problem solving; (2) collaboration and leadership; (3) agility and adaptability; (4) initiative and entrepreneurialism; (5) effective oral and written communication; (6) accessing and analyzing information; and (7) curiosity and imagination. Wagner proposes that schools use academic content to teach these skills at every grade level, and be accountable for a new standard of rigor. (Wagner, 2008.)

The development of the Iowa 21st century essential concepts and skills was a collaborative process engaging the expertise of p – 16 educators, business, and industry representatives. Sources used for this work included the Framework for 21st Century Learning, from the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, enGauge, and the 1991 SCANS report, What Work Requires of Schools. The committee surveyed the literature and endeavored to bring together the common elements of these frameworks. The members outlined the concepts, dispositions and habits of mind believed essential for success in the 21st century.

Denver Community Schools Learner Performance Goals

These learner performance goals are the general expectations for all Denver graduates. They were recommended by the Educational Advisory Committee (EAC) and established by the Board in 1995. Students completing their education at Denver should demonstrate the following: (LC6)

Collaborative Worker
•Participates as a team member
•Assesses and Adjusts behavior
•Applies conflict management strategies
•Demonstrates effective interpersonal skills
•Works toward and follows through with group goals

Problem Solver
•Identifies problems •Gathers information from appropriate sources
•Generates a variety of options •Applies strategies to make decisions
•Verifies and interprets results with respect to the original problem

Quality Producer
•Manages time
•Creates product that reflects quality
•Monitors and assesses progress
•Assumes responsibility for actions

Knowledgeable Person
•Possesses knowledge base, facts and resources and strategies
•Able and willing to learn

Effective Communicator

•Expresses ideas and demonstrates knowledge and ability to listen, speak, read, write and use non-verbal communication clearly and concisely
•Adapts messages to various audiences and purposes

Self-directed Learner
•Builds on previous knowledge
•Uses knowledge base to reflect aesthetically
•Sets realistic priorities and achievable goals
•Demonstrates planning and follow through

Denver Community Schools Long-Range Student Achievement 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 be used to assess 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 Comprehensive Test in Grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Reading Comprehension Test in Grades 9 and 11, included data disaggregated by subgroup.

1b. Percentage of students in Grades 2-10 who achieve at the proficient level or above on the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Reading Comprehension.

1c. Percentage of students in Grade 3 who are independent readers at grade level on the Informal Reading Inventory (IRI)

1d. Percentage of students in Grades 1 and 2 who are independent readers at grade level on the Observation Survey/Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA2)

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 be used to assess 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 Math Totals Test in Grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Mathematics Test in Grades 9 and 11, included data disaggregated by subgroup.

2b. Percentage of students in Grades 2-10 who achieve at the proficient level or above on the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Mathematics Assessment Test.

2c. Percentage of students in Grade 10 who achieve at the proficient level or above on the PLAN Math test.

Goal 3: All K-12 students will achieve at high levels in science, prepared for success beyond high. (LRG3, MCGF3, AR6, EIG1)

The following indicators will be used to assess 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 3 through 8 and the ITED Science Test in Grades 9 and 11, included data disaggregated by subgroup.

3b. Percentage of students in Grades 2-10 who achieve at the proficient level or above on the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Science Test

3c. Percentage of students in Grade 10 who achieve at the proficient level or above on the PLAN Science test

Goal 4: All K-12 students will use technology in developing proficiency in reading, mathematics, and science. (FTP1, AR6)

The following indicators will be used to assess progress with Goal 4:

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

4b. Percentage of students at Grade 8 who score at the proficient level or above on Denver Community School District's 8th Grade Technology Assessment

Goal 5: All students will feel safe and connected to school.

The following indicators will be used to assess progress with Goal 5:

5a. Attendance rate as measured by the average daily attendance data calculated and reported on the Certified Annual Report (CAR).

5b. Graduation rate as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education using data from the Spring BEDS report.

5c. Percentage of students in elementary, middle, and high schools who receive discipline referrals (office referrals, suspensions, and expulsions). (SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)

5d. Percentage of students in grades 5, 8 and 10 that report they feel safe at school on the Building Tomorrow: Culture & Climate Partnership Survey. (SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)

Part 2B.

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

Once the long-ranged goals are set, input from the entire professional staff will be used to develop action plans and strategies to meet the goals annually. Using the Iowa Professional Development Model process, the Individual District Career Development Plan (SMART GOALS) will be developed. District action plans and building-specific implementation plans will also be developed.

Part 2C:

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

- Leveled Guided Reading Groups (K-5)
- Instructional Reading Series (Harcourt Trophies) (K-5)
- Reading and Writing Workshops (1-10)
- Daily Oral Language (K-8)
- Silent Reading (1-5)
- Cooperative Learning
- Character Counts
- Hands-on Science (6-12)
- Brain-based Strategies
- The Daily Five (K-5)
- 6 + 1 Traits Writing (K-5)
- Professional Learning Communities (K-5)

Instructional Programs/Services Supports Currently Used in the District

- Individual District Career Development Plans
- Gifted and Talented Program/Services (TAG, K-12)
- Mentoring and Induction Program
- Alternative High School (9-12)
- General Education Interventions (K-12)
- Career Guidance (Choices) (8-12)
- Conflict Resolution (6-12)
- DARE Program (6th and 8th)
- Student Service Partnerships (mental health, community health,) (K-12)
- Supplementary Remedial Reading Services (K-5) (AMN2)
- Supplementary Remedial Math Services (K-5) (AMN2)
- DIBELS data analysis training
- Reading Counts (Grades 6-9)
  E2T2 implementation in the areas of Math, Science and Technology
- Perkins: Vocational and Technical Education Programs (9-12)
- Title I, Part A: Reading Program/Services (1-6) (AR7, IEI1)
- Title II, Part D: Technology Usage
- Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program/Services
- Title V: Innovative Programs and Parental Choice

- Title VI: State-wide Assessment
- Reduced Class-size teacher in reading

System-wide Management Supports Currently Used in the District
- Resource Allocation (e.g., financial and personnel)
- Technology (data management system and infrastructure)
- Policy Development
- Personnel Evaluation Systems (administrators, teachers, support staff)
- Curriculum Development (Curriculum Manager)
- Iowa Core Curriculum
- Leadership for CSIP Implementation
- Teacher Quality Leadership
- Olweus (anti-bullying)

Part 2D:

How is our current practice aligned with or supported by the research base?

Using an action research process, we considered the available research base and local student data. Both the research and local data indicate that our current practices should contribute (or have contributed to) positive students results. We relied upon the Iowa Content Area Networks, learning team searches on the web, the AEA, and local content area experts to access information about practices supported by scientifically based research.

Current Practices Supported by Research and/or Local Data
The district has determined that research and/or local student data support the use of several of our current practices/programs related to the goal areas. These practices/programs are considered to be implemented with fidelity and to the level appropriate within the district:
- Daily Oral Language
- Reading Recovery (AMN1)
- Leveled Reading Groups / Daily Five (AMN1)
- Instructional Reading Series (Harcourt Trophies)
- Brain-Based Learning Strategies
- Differentiated Instruction
- Inquiry Based Science Instruction (AMN3)

Current Practices Supported by Research and/or Local Data, but show need for increased fidelity of strategy and/or wider implementation.
The district has determined that there are several research-based strategies/programs that are implemented somewhere in the Denver system, but are not utilized at all appropriate grade levels or found in all applicable settings, OR are not being implemented with rigor and fidelity. The district will explore ways to improve and deepen implementation of these strategies:
- Reading Counts

- Small Group Instruction (AMN2)
- Reading and Writing Workshops
- Silent Sustained Reading
- Cooperative Learning
- Character Counts

Research Needed.
Teacher Quality, Iowa Core Curriculum, and District Administrative Teams will continue to collect and review the literature base on the following practices/programs. The teams will establish timelines within the next five years for each of the following areas of study:
Characteristics of Effective Instruction/Iowa Core: Fall, 2009
Olweus: Spring, 2011
Technology: On-going
Professional Learning Communities: Fall, 2010

Program/Services Current Practice
The Teacher Quality, Iowa Core Curriculum, and District Administrative Teams will also use a goal-oriented approach for program evaluation (clear expectations, results data, and targeted program/service evaluation) to determine program effectiveness relative to CSIP goals and other program goals.

Part 2E:
What gaps exist between our current practice to support long-range goals and the research base (including curriculum and instruction)?

Curriculum/Assessment Alignment
We are currently in the process of realigning our current curriculum/assessment tools to meet the Iowa Department of Education expectations. During this process, we are aligning our current local curriculum with the defined Iowa Core Curriculum and the recent National Common Core Curriculum. To support us with this alignment process, we are using the Curriculum Manager Software. Our main focus of alignment currently evolves around our core content areas.

Instructional Strategy Decisions
In review of our instructional practices, it was apparent that we have some practices with a documented research base that are well-implemented throughout the district. There are also some practices with a weak research base or inconsistent implementation, and some practices with no research base. Within the next five years the following will be addressed:

1) The discontinuation of practices that are not supported by research or have not produced evidence of contributing to the positive student results
2) The consistent implementation of strategies that are research-based and/or have contributed to gains in student achievement

Part 2F:

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, 4, and 5

Implement the DCSD Career Development Plan (AMN1, AMN2, IEI1, TQ7) that describes district-level professional development efforts aligned with prioritized student needs. The entire district will concentrate on student achievement/instruction in Reading Comprehension, Math Elements, Science Inquiry, as well as the overall Technology Education.

These selected professional development targets were based on student data. Teacher practices and staff input were also studied to help identify professional development needs. This aligns with long-range goals #1, #2, #3, and #4. (PD6, TQ1, TQ2) The plan describes a cycle in which professional development efforts will be targeted on student learning and sustained until student gains are acquired. At least 80 percent of professional development time and resources will be focused on learning new content and instructional practices (TQ3, TQ4, FTP3) relating Effective Teaching Strategies, Differentiated Instruction, Assessment, and Brain-Based Instruction.

Research based strategies.

Our Iowa Core Curriculum and Teacher Quality Teams, consisting of representatives from all buildings, reviewed research on the strategies below and found that they have resulted in significant student achievement gains. In addition, we applied the following federal criteria to determine if a program/strategy has a quality research base:

1) Evidence of positive student results demonstrated by research that employed systematic empirical methods and;

2) The research was described in studies that demonstrated the use of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. (PD5, SDF9)

Participation. All staff (teachers, administrators, counselors, etc) will be engaged in training. This includes those responsible for Title I, Special Education, At-Risk, ELL, and Gifted and Talented. Working with the AEA, staff will be able to receive licensure renewal credits for participation in district-wide and building-wide professional development programs, including implementation of new strategies into their classrooms. (PERK1, SPED1, TQ8)

Professional Development Content

Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, all professional instructional staff will be involved directly/indirectly with the following (FTP2, FTP4, FTP5):

- Professional Learning Communities (K-12)
- Olweus (K-12)
- Iowa Core Concept Based Learning (K-12)
- Iowa Core Assessment for Learning (K-12)
- Curriculum Manager (K-12)
- Integrating Technology into the Classroom (K-12)

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 (specifically lb. 1c, ld, le, and lf).
Standard #2 Demonstrated competence in content knowledge (specifically 2b and 2d).
Standard #3 Demonstrates competence in planning and preparation for instruction (specifically 3a, 3b, 3d, and 3e).
Standard #4 Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meet the multiple learning needs of students (specifically 4a, 4b, and 4f).
Standard #6 Demonstrates competence in classroom management (all).
Standard #7 Professional Development (all)

Professional Development Learning Opportunities
Implementation of the district career development plan will include the following components: (TQ8)
•Eight common professional development dates for all staff members to collaborate, establish new learning, and build professional learning communities.
•Leadership meetings with the Teacher Quality Leadership Team and Iowa Core Leadership Team
•Monthly professional learning communities team meetings to discuss and review identified goals

Professional Development Providers
Various AEA267 Consultants will provide support and direction as the professional development experts for the local district. The Iowa Department of Education accredits these providers. (TQ6)

Part 2G.
How will we support implementation of the identified action?

Implementation plans for actions previously described for CSIP goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 will be developed annually. They will include the following:
•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

Question 3: How do/will we know that student learning has changed?

3A.

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

Denver 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, and perceptual data/surveys. Various District Leadership Teams will ensure that data from these assessment measures are collected, analyzed, and shared with the CSIP Advisory Committee Team at their fall and spring meetings. 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
As stated previously (Question 2A), Denver will monitor progress on its long-range goals through analysis of aggregated and disaggregated trend line data from the following sources:

Goal 1:
•ITBS Reading Comprehension test in grades 3 through 8
•ITED Reading Comprehension test in grades 9 and 11
•MAP Reading Comprehension assessment in grades 2 through 10. (DWAP6)
•IRI test in grades 3, 4, and 5 (DWAP3, DWAP4, DWAP6)
•DRA assessment in grade 1
•DIBELS in Kindergarten, First, and Second Grades (DWAP3, DWAP4)
•PLAN Test, Reading sub-test in grade 10
•ACT Test, Reading sub-test in grades 11 and 12

Goal 2:
•ITBS Mathematics Total test in grades 3 through 8.
•ITED Math Total in grades 9 and 11
•MAP Math assessment in grades 2 through 10. (DWAP7)
•PLAN Test, Math sub-test in grade 10 (DWAP7)
•ACT Test, Math sub-test in grades 11 and 12

Goal 3:
•ITBS Science test in grades 4 and 8.
•ITED Science test in grade 11
•MAP Science assessment in grades 2 through 10. (DWAP8)
•PLAN Test, Science sub-test in grade 10 (DWAP8)
•ACT Test, Science sub-test in grades 11 and 12

Goal 4:
•Indicators identified for Goals 1, 2, and 3.
•Locally determined technology assessment administered in grade 8.
•Increase technology awareness by offer classes daily in grade 5, and yearly in grades 6-8
•Increase technology instruction by purchasing mobile labs, science computer probes, installing a graphics lab, music software, and CAD lab for PLTW classes

Goal 5:
•Attendance rate from district's student information system

•Graduation rate as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education (Spring BEDS report)
•Percentage of students in elementary, middle, and high school who receive discipline referrals (office referrals, suspensions, and expulsions)
•Percentage of students in grades 5, 8 and 10 who report they feel safe at school on the Building Tomorrow: Culture & Climate Partnership Survey. (SDF2)

Alignment of Standards and Assessments—Curriculum Manager

To make certain that the assessments used to monitor progress on long-range achievement goals are aligned with the district's curriculum, DCSD is currently entering curriculum standards and benchmarks in Curriculum Manager Software.. Through the completion of this process, the district will be able to monitor the successful implementation of Iowa Core, National Common Core, and MISIC Curriculums. The district will also analyze the DIBELS, BRI, DRA2, ACT, and PLAN assessments, and align them with standards and benchmarks.

Student Indicator Data Used for Evaluation of Programs and Services

The same student indicator data used to measure progress with CSIP goals will also be used to help inform decisions regarding the effectiveness of the following programs and services provided by Denver.
•Professional development for teachers and principals (District Career Development Plan)
•Supplemental reading services for eligible students (Title I)
•Use of technology to improve student achievement (E2T2)
•Early intervention program for grades K-3 (Class-Size Reduction Funds)
•Drug and violence prevention program (DARE)
•K-12 gifted and talented (TAG) program
•Special Education services (AR6, AR7)
•Career and Technical education (CTE) programs

Additional Data Gathering and Analysis
To help provide a more complete picture of student learning needs, Denver will continue to monitor the following data sources: (DWAP3, DWAP4, DWAP6, DWAP7)
•All data points included in the district's Annual Progress Report (APR).
•The percentage of students who participate in district-wide assessment. (DWAP1)
•The percentage of students in the lowest (at risk or deficit) category in DIBELS in grades K.
•Annual cohort performance from grade 3 through grade 11 as measured by the ITBS and ITED in the areas of reading, mathematics, and science.
•Cognitive Abilities Tests in grades 3 and 6 (TAG)
•CTE student data from the end of year program report (Perkins)

Future Data Gathering

During the 2010-2011 school year:
•Discipline Referrals (grades K-12)
•Project Lead the Way End-of-Course Assessments (grades 7-12)
•Building Tomorrow Survey (grades 4-11)

During the 2011-2012 school year:
•Iowa Youth Survey (grades 6, 8, 11)
•Post Graduate Success
•Implementation data for technology (E2T2 participants)

During the 2012-2013 school year:
•MAP Assessment Results Student/Grade Level
•DRA2-IRI Summative Yearly Tracking (Elementary)
•Olweus Implementation Review (K-12)

Question 4: How will we evaluate our programs and services to ensure improved student learning?

4A.
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

Denver 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 that affect performance
• Identification of 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

Denver 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 process 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 Denver incorporates into its CSIP will occur within a five-year rotation.

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

• Professional Development program (District Career Development plan) Annually, 2010 (TQ10, TQ11)
• Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training/Recruiting) Annually, 2010 (TPTR1)
• Title I, Part A (Parent Involvement) Annually, 2010 (TITL1)
• Mentoring and Induction Program (every three years), review in 2011 (TQ9)
• Title II, Part D (E2T2) (every three years), review in 2013 (FTP6)
• Title IV (Safe and Drug Free School) Annually, (funding discontinued in 2010) (SDF10)
• Title III (Language Instruction for ELL), review in 2012 (LEP1, LEP2, LEP3)
• Talented and Gifted Program (every five years), review in 2012 (GT2)
• Perkins (Vocational/career and Technical Education Programs) Annually, 2010 (PERK1, PERK2, PERK3)
• At-risk Program (every five years), review in 2013 (AR4)
• Special Education Programs and Services, Annually, 2010 (SPED1, ESPE1, ESPE2)

Denver 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 Comprehensive School Improvement (Advisory) Team (CSIT), and the Board of Education.

4B.
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
Denver 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. Evaluation of the following data will assist in determining the effectiveness of these programs.
- Professional development program (district career development plan) (TQ11)
- Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs) (PERK1, PERK2, PERK3)
- Mentoring and Induction Program (TQ9)
- At-Risk Program (AR4)
- Special Education Programs and Services (ESPE2)
- Title I, Part A (Parent Involvement Program) (TITL1)
- Title II, Part A (Class Size Reduction) (TPTR1)
- Title II, Part D (E2T2) (FTP6)
- 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 Denver'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 who participate in district, building, and individual career development opportunities.
•Percentage of K-12 teachers who accurately use differentiated instructional strategies as measured by observations and implementation logs.
•Percentage of K-12 teachers who integrate technology in their classrooms as measured by observations and implementation logs.
•Percentage of grade 3-11 students who are proficient on ITBS/ITED or NWEA MAP assessments.

Gifted and Talented Program (GT2)
Denver will use the same district-wide assessment data to identify gifted and talented students and to evaluate their progress. These assessments include the ITBS/ITED and the NWEA MAP tests. The following indicators will determine the effectiveness of the gifted and talented program.
•Percentage of all students participating in the gifted and talented program who meet growth goals on the NWEA MAP test.
•Percentage of students participating in the gifted and talented program who show growth on the ITBS/ITED tests, using standard scores.

Perkins (Vocational/Career an Technical Education Programs) (PERK1, 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 the Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who meet their IEP goals.

Title 1, 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)

*At this time DCSD has no English Language Learners. We have trained personnel on the procedures/regulations for this if a need for this program should occur.