

Title I District in Need of Assistance (DINA) Action Plan for the Academic Years: 2010-2011 and 2011-2012

District: Davenport Community School District Draft/Final Date: 09/11/2010

X Identification for Year VI - Reading **Sub-groups:** **Grades 3-5: All Students, Low SES, IEP, ELL, African American, Hispanic, Multi-Racial**
Grades 6-8: All Students, Low SES, IEP, ELL, African American, Hispanic, Multi-Racial
Grade 11: All Students, Low SES, IEP, African American, Hispanic, White

X Identification for Year V – Math **Sub-groups:** **Grades 3-5: Low SES, IEP, ELL, African American, Hispanic, Multi-Racial**
Grades 6-8: All Students, Low SES, IEP, ELL, African American, Hispanic, Multi-Racial
Grade 11: All Students, Low SES, IEP, African American, Hispanic, White, Multi-Racial

This plan has included the following:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Actions for Reading	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Actions for Parent Engagement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10% Allocation of Title I Dollars	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mentoring of New and Experienced Teachers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Actions for Math	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Actions for Assessing Evaluability		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence-Based Research
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Actions for Leadership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Identified Needs of Students		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outside Technical Assistance

District Long- Range CSIP Goal for Identified Area:	All students will reach high levels of literacy, mathematics and science and will feel safe and connected to school.
Persons writing the plan	Dawn Anderson Rascher, Director of Assessment, Equity and Record Services Laura Isele, Math Instruction Specialist Kathleen Learn, Secondary Language Arts Coordinator Cindy Lewis, Elementary Language Arts Instruction Specialist Patti Pace-Tracey, Director of Exceptional Education Ellen Reilly, Learning Supports Specialist Juli Staszewski, Director of Curriculum & Staff Development

Diagnosis Summary:
What do data tell us
about student learning
needs?

Diagnosis Summary: During the audit and diagnosis process, the following data sources were reviewed and analyzed: ITBS, ITED, End-of-Course Exams, Reading and Math Summative Data, DIBELS.

The District is seeing success with many of the “interventions” that are currently in place. However, beyond the summative data that the intervention has improved student achievement, the District has only begun to collect formative data to see how the intervention is working and how it contributes to the results. This type of data is needed to analyze the intervention at a deeper level to ensure the outcomes are fully realized and can be replicated.

Reading Comprehension 3-5						
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-09	2009-10
Trajectory	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%
All Students	73.0%	67.3%	76.8%	71.1%	76.9%	72.6%
Low SES	66.2%	56.4%	68.4%	63.6%	68.8%	64.7%
IEP	19.0%	19.6%	36.6%	32.4%	41.3%	36.2%
ELL	65.9%	43.2%	71.3%	67.7%	72.3%	63.2%
African American	56.9%	50.3%	64.2%	58.5%	67.3%	56.2%
Asian	<30	67.9%	85.7%	82.3%	86.9%	86.4%
Hispanic	70.7%	60.4%	72.3%	69.4%	71.4%	65.4%
White	78.1%	73.1%	81.1%	75.4%	80.9%	78.7%
Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	68.0%

Reading Comprehension 6-8						
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-09	2009-10
Trajectory	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%	73.3%	73.3%	73.3%
All Students	57.8%	59.2%	66.3%	67.7%	69.1%	64.9%
Low SES	42.5%	42.6%	56.1%	58.8%	59.1%	55.3%
IEP	10.8%	12.3%	28.8%	34.7%	31.4%	24.2%
ELL	<30	32.0%	56.7%	59.8%	45.7%	52.4%
African American	32.1%	38.1%	51.4%	52.1%	52.8%	44.9%
Asian	54.6%	<30	69.4%	72.9%	66.7%	73.7%
Hispanic	59.8%	48.2%	54.2%	67.5%	67.7%	63.6%
White	64.2%	66.0%	72.6%	72.7%	74.7%	70.9%
Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61.2%

	Reading Comprehension 11					
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-09	2009-10
Trajectory	74.20%	74.20%	74.20%	79.30%	79.30%	79.3%
All Students	58.53%	66.76%	68.18%	74.34%	70.20%	68.5%
Low SES	42.39%	50.13%	50.50%	63.36%	54.40%	55.1%
IEP	12.95%	14.06%	15.62%	13.50%	14.40%	19.8%
ELL	<30	41.67%	<30	<30	<30	<30
African American	45.16%	35.54%	43.18%	53.62%	38.30%	43.3%
Asian	90.00%	92.90%	89.30%	93.70%	<30	<30
Hispanic	42.47%	50.94%	63.33%	76.79%	71.8%	66.3%
White	62.37%	74.21%	74.14%	72.41%	75.7%	73.3%
Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	74.2%

Source of data - AYP REPORT

First three years on 4, 8, 11

Remaining years on summary of 3-5, 6-8, 11

	Math Total 3-5					
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-09	2009-10
Trajectory	68.30%	68.30%	68.30%	74.70%	74.7%	74.4%
All Students	76.08%	75.58%	79.38%	77.56%	75.4%	74.6%
Low SES	69.26%	66.18%	71.16%	69.71%	66.8%	66.7%
IEP	35.11%	39.69%	47.57%	41.18%	41.7%	42.8%
ELL	83.30%	62.20%	76.90%	78.20%	75.0%	67.2%
African American	58.46%	53.65%	62.56%	62.59%	60.5%	56.9%
Asian	90.00%	92.90%	89.30%	93.70%	85.7%	89.4%
Hispanic	75.00%	65.60%	78.20%	74.30%	70.9%	67.7%
White	80.70%	82.40%	84.38%	82.60%	80.9%	81.0%
Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	68.6%

	Math Total 6-8					
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-09	2009-10
Trajectory	65.0%	65.0%	65.0%	72.0%	72.0%	72.0%
All Students	56.7%	61.8%	71.7%	72.5%	66.4%	66.7%
Low SES	41.9%	47.9%	62.1%	63.7%	54.7%	57.1%
IEP	14.2%	11.0%	33.9%	40.2%	19.6%	26.7%
ELL	<30	<30	81.1%	73.2%	60.0%	57.3%
African American	23.1%	29.1%	55.5%	54.3%	44.4%	44.9%
Asian	67.7%	74.3%	85.7%	87.1%	85.7%	82.5%
Hispanic	58.5%	60.0%	68.2%	72.3%	65.4%	62.8%
White	64.5%	69.8%	76.8%	78.1%	73.2%	73.7%
Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	63.1%

	Math Total 11					
	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-09	2009-10
Trajectory	74.2%	74.2%	74.2%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%
All Students	61.8%	65.4%	64.8%	70.4%	68.5%	70.1%
Low SES	42.5%	46.6%	48.0%	56.0%	54.8%	55.4%
IEP	23.0%	12.0%	18.6%	18.1%	16.7%	19.8%
ELL	<30	<30	<30	<30	<30	<30
African American	43.1%	30.5%	42.8%	40.9%	40.9%	44.2%
Asian	<30	<30	<30	83.3%	<30	<30
Hispanic	43.8%	54.9%	61.7%	64.3%	65.4%	64.4%
White	62.4%	76.7%	69.8%	75.9%	73.1%	76.30%
Multit-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58.10%

Source of data - AYP REPORT
First three years on 4, 8, 11
Remaining years on summary of 3-5, 6-8, 11

District Goal Statement for SINA to support prioritized learning needs.	By May 2011, the number of students in the needs category in each grade band (3-5, 6-8, 11) will decrease by at least 10 % from the 2009-2010 numbers as measured by the ITBS/ITED reading comprehension and mathematics test.
---	--

Indicators of Progress: How will/do we know student learning has changed?	Summative Evaluation Question(s)	Formative Data Questions Aligned to Summative Evaluation Question(s)																																																																																																
	<p>How will we know reading comprehension and math achievement have improved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percent of students in the needs category as measured by the ITBS/ITED reading comprehension and math subtest will decrease by 10% from the 2009-2010 numbers. <table border="1" data-bbox="446 508 1177 959"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Reading Comprehension</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="4">Percent of Students in Needs Category, 2009-10</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Sub-group</th> <th>Grades 3-5</th> <th>Grades 6-8</th> <th>Grade 11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All Students</td> <td>27.4%</td> <td>35.1%</td> <td>31.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low SES</td> <td>35.3%</td> <td>44.7%</td> <td>44.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>63.8%</td> <td>75.8%</td> <td>81.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELL</td> <td>26.8%</td> <td>47.6%</td> <td><30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>African American</td> <td>43.8%</td> <td>55.1%</td> <td>56.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>13.6%</td> <td>26.3%</td> <td><30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>34.6%</td> <td>36.4%</td> <td>33.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>21.3%</td> <td>29.1%</td> <td>26.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-Racial</td> <td>32.0%</td> <td>38.8%</td> <td>35.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="446 995 1177 1445"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Math Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="4">Percent of Students in Needs Category, 2009-10</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Sub-group</th> <th>Grades 3-5</th> <th>Grades 6-8</th> <th>Grade 11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All Students</td> <td>35.4%</td> <td>33.3%</td> <td>29.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low SES</td> <td>33.3%</td> <td>42.9%</td> <td>44.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>57.2%</td> <td>73.3%</td> <td>81.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELL</td> <td>32.8%</td> <td>42.7%</td> <td><30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>African American</td> <td>43.1%</td> <td>55.1%</td> <td>55.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>17.5%</td> <td><30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic</td> <td>32.3%</td> <td>37.2%</td> <td>35.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>19.0%</td> <td>26.3%</td> <td>33.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-Racial</td> <td>31.4%</td> <td>36.9%</td> <td>41.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Reading Comprehension				Percent of Students in Needs Category, 2009-10				Sub-group	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grade 11	All Students	27.4%	35.1%	31.5%	Low SES	35.3%	44.7%	44.9%	IEP	63.8%	75.8%	81.8%	ELL	26.8%	47.6%	<30	African American	43.8%	55.1%	56.7%	Asian	13.6%	26.3%	<30	Hispanic	34.6%	36.4%	33.7%	White	21.3%	29.1%	26.7%	Multi-Racial	32.0%	38.8%	35.8%	Math Total				Percent of Students in Needs Category, 2009-10				Sub-group	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grade 11	All Students	35.4%	33.3%	29.9%	Low SES	33.3%	42.9%	44.6%	IEP	57.2%	73.3%	81.2%	ELL	32.8%	42.7%	<30	African American	43.1%	55.1%	55.8%	Asian	10.6%	17.5%	<30	Hispanic	32.3%	37.2%	35.6%	White	19.0%	26.3%	33.7%	Multi-Racial	31.4%	36.9%	41.9%	<p>How will we know reading comprehension and math achievement have improved?</p> <p>READING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percent of students indicated as at-risk on the DIBELS assessment at the end of their Kindergarten year will decrease from the 2009-2010 numbers. Students will show growth on intervention reports: Read Naturally, Scholastic Reading Inventory, Lexia, Fast ForWord, GRADE, SAM reports and Reading Recovery. The percent of K-6 students proficient on reading unit and benchmark tests will increase from previous year(s). The percent of students proficient on district-developed benchmark assessments and end-of-course exams will increase from previous year(s). <p>MATH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percent of K-5 students proficient on math periodic and comprehension assessments will increase from previous year(s). The percent of students proficient on the end-of-course exams will increase from previous school year(s). Students will show growth on the Scholastic Math Inventory and SAM reports.
Reading Comprehension																																																																																																		
Percent of Students in Needs Category, 2009-10																																																																																																		
Sub-group	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grade 11																																																																																															
All Students	27.4%	35.1%	31.5%																																																																																															
Low SES	35.3%	44.7%	44.9%																																																																																															
IEP	63.8%	75.8%	81.8%																																																																																															
ELL	26.8%	47.6%	<30																																																																																															
African American	43.8%	55.1%	56.7%																																																																																															
Asian	13.6%	26.3%	<30																																																																																															
Hispanic	34.6%	36.4%	33.7%																																																																																															
White	21.3%	29.1%	26.7%																																																																																															
Multi-Racial	32.0%	38.8%	35.8%																																																																																															
Math Total																																																																																																		
Percent of Students in Needs Category, 2009-10																																																																																																		
Sub-group	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grade 11																																																																																															
All Students	35.4%	33.3%	29.9%																																																																																															
Low SES	33.3%	42.9%	44.6%																																																																																															
IEP	57.2%	73.3%	81.2%																																																																																															
ELL	32.8%	42.7%	<30																																																																																															
African American	43.1%	55.1%	55.8%																																																																																															
Asian	10.6%	17.5%	<30																																																																																															
Hispanic	32.3%	37.2%	35.6%																																																																																															
White	19.0%	26.3%	33.7%																																																																																															
Multi-Racial	31.4%	36.9%	41.9%																																																																																															

Evidence-Based Research Source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Reading Programs PreK-6: <i>Little Treasures</i>, <i>Treasures (Core)</i>, <i>Triumphs (Intervention)</i>, <i>Treasure Chest (ELL)</i> are aligned to the findings of the National Reading Panel’s (NRP) key components of reading instruction balanced with a Writing Workshop designed to develop the writing process. The programs are aligned to the Iowa Core and our district’s standards and benchmarks in preschool, language arts, children in special education, and children learning English as a Second Language. • Jamestown Reading Navigator and READ 180 are aligned with the following key points of <i>Reading Next</i>: explicit instruction, effective instructional principles embedded in content, motivation and self-directed learning, text-based collaborative learning, strategic tutoring, diverse texts, a technology component, ongoing formative assessment of students, extended time for literacy, professional development, ongoing, summative assessment of students and programs, leadership, and a comprehensive and coordinated literacy program. • Reading Intervention uses Corrective Reading programming. This program and System 44 align with the NRP’s components of phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Direct instruction is a key component of this program. • The National Science Foundation has recognized <i>Growing with Mathematics</i> as a research-based program appropriate for all student populations. <i>Connect Mathematics 2</i> is based on research, and was field-tested in diverse sites across the country. A growing body of research and evaluation reports indicates that CMP outperforms non-CMP curricula on tests of problem-solving ability, equals or outperforms non-CMP curricula on skills tests, and promotes long-term retention. These standards-based programs are used in Pre-K through 8th grade and align to the Iowa Core and our district’s standards and benchmarks. Both programs provide manipulatives and resources for teachers. Problem-based investigations are an integral part of the programs. Use of technology is incorporated into classroom activities. • McGehee, Jean. “The Coaching/Mentoring Phase of a Professional Development Partnership Project,” <i>Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education, Hosted by Virginia Tech University Hotel Roanoke & Conference Center, Roanoke, VA, Oct 20, 2005</i> “When teachers expect more learning and try more innovative practices...student achievement and teacher practice are positively impacted. These changes come from teachers who understand the point of studying demonstration lessons and more from the demonstration phase into coaching and mentoring.” • Southern Regional Education Board: 592 10 St. N.W., Atlanta, Ga. 30318. Founded in 1948, the Southern Regional Education Board is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that works with leaders and policy-makers in 16 member states to improve pre-K through postsecondary education. Through many nationally recognized programs and services, SREB’s mission is helping states achieve the 12 Challenge to Lead Goals for Education. • International Reading Association • Iowa Core • National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
--------------------------------	--

<p>Content for the professional development identified through research:</p>	<p>Based upon the results of the audit and diagnosis process, the district leadership team will provide professional development to instructional administrators and teachers in the effective use of instructional strategies and data to monitor student achievement and monitor instructional strategies in the classroom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The district will identify professional development providers to conduct training. ▪ The district will continue to provide professional development for instructional administrators and specialists on formal and informal monitoring of classroom techniques (E-walk). ▪ District Elementary and Secondary Achievement Initiatives will continue to provide professional development to building-based content area teams. ▪ The district will provide professional development on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Response to Intervention ▫ Data Analysis ▫ Intervention Strategies/Software ▫ Iowa Core <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characteristics of Effective Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment for Learning ▪ Student Centered Classroom ▪ Teaching for Learner Differences ▪ Rigor and Relevance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teaching for Understanding • Differentiated Instruction ▫ Co-teaching ▫ New Teacher Induction ▪ Southern Regional Education Board will continue to provide professional development on key practices of Making Middle Grades Work and High Schools that Work ▪ 10% of regularly allocated Title I funds will be withheld to support articulated professional development
--	---

<p>Peer Review Process</p>	<p>Date Planned for Peer Review: September, 2010</p> <p>Districts/AEA/Individuals Involved in Peer Review: Trampus Budde, Sector Coordinator Area IV (MBAEA) Pam Ehly, Director of Instruction (Iowa City, IA) Dr. Ann Mausbach, Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction (Council Bluffs, IA) Dr. Gary O'Malley, ESC Associate Superintendent (Cedar Rapids, IA) Margaret VanFossen, Assistant Coordinator of Market Research (MBAEA) Steve Weisman, School Improvement Consultant (SREB) Jeffrey Zoul, School Improvement Consultant (SREB)</p> <p>Additional review process with District Leadership Team, Principals, Instructional Support Team, Curriculum Council, and Local School Improvement Advisory Council,</p> <p>Process for Peer Review: District Presentation/Clarifying Questions/Electronic Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Date Peer Review Actually Completed: September, 2010
----------------------------	---

Implementation:	Changes/Impact on Stakeholders	Data Collected to Inform Change	Alignment and Responsibilities	Monitoring & Adjustment
How will the goal be achieved?	Identification of changes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Knowledge 2. Skills 3. Attitudes 4. Aspirations 5. Behaviors. 	How will we collect the information about the change? (e.g., tests, surveys, focus groups, interviews, logs, observations, rating scales) What data sources would best answer our formative and summative questions?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Iowa Professional Development Model Component 2. Person(s) Responsible 3. Time (when & how much) 4. Resources 	The data collected from stakeholders and decisions made.
Action #1: Notification of Parents and Community	Changes/Impact on Stakeholders	Data Collected to Inform Change	Alignment and Responsibilities	Monitoring & Adjustment
Public notification following guidelines provided by Iowa Department of Education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parents: Increased understanding of district's status and plan for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Notification documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors 	
Action # 2: Audit, Diagnosis, and Design	Changes/Impact on Stakeholders	Data Collected to Inform Change	Alignment and Responsibilities	Monitoring & Adjustment
Completion of Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District Leadership Team: Increased understanding of district data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program Data ▪ ITBS/ITED ▪ ACT, Explore and Plan ▪ Iowa End-of-Course Exams (IEOC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Assessment ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development 	
Completion of Diagnosis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District Leadership Team: Identification of areas of concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of data ▪ Diagnosis summary review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Assessment 	
Completion of Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District Leadership Team: Complete action plan that will provide course of action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completed action plan, including plan for evaluation. ▪ Monthly review of action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development 	
Communication of Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholders will understand district's plan for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communicate Plan through Principals, Instructional Support Team, District Leadership Team, Curriculum Councils, Local School Improvement Advisory Council, Board of Education ▪ Posted on district website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development 	

Action #3: Leadership	Changes/Impact on Stakeholders	Data Collected to Inform Change	Alignment and Responsibilities	Monitoring & Adjustment
Cultivate a shared vision of quality instruction based on Iowa Core and best practices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administrators will know and understand Characteristics of Effective Instruction and identify best practices in the classroom. Protocols for consistent expectations will be used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Professional development evaluation sheets ▪ Meeting sign-in sheets ▪ Meeting agendas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development ▪ Principals 	
Develop a culture that meets the needs of each and every child through Response to Intervention (RTI).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased understanding of RTI: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Year One: Administration ○ Year Two: Entire Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluations after training ▪ CBAM ▪ Building plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development ▪ Principals 	
Establish data teams to review data and make recommendations for instruction and professional development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased use of data to make informed instructional and professional development decisions. ▪ Building and district teams meet regularly to analyze data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Walk-through data ▪ Data walls in each building ▪ Building data reports sent to Executive Directors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development ▪ Principals 	
Implement an accountability system that defines expectations and monitors fidelity of implementation of identified strategies to impact student learning. This includes walk-through training for building leadership teams.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leadership demonstrates clear understanding of expectations. ▪ Leaders communicate expectations ▪ Leaders monitor implementation ▪ Increased use of identified instructional strategies by teachers and students with intentionality. ▪ Leaders collect and analyze teacher implementation data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy implementation data ▪ E-walk data ▪ Implementation data, staff summaries, and analysis ▪ Building professional development meeting agendas ▪ E-Walk data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development ▪ Principals 	

Action # 4: Instruction	Changes/Impact on Stakeholders	Data Collected to Inform Change	Alignment and Responsibilities	Monitoring & Adjustment
Provide professional development on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response to Intervention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Data Analysis ◦ Intervention Strategies/Software ◦ Sheltered Instruction ▪ Iowa Core <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Characteristics of Effective Instruction ◦ Differentiated Instruction ▪ Co-Teaching ▪ Key practices of MMGW/HSTW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teachers increase understanding of Iowa Core, RTI, and co-teaching. ▪ Teachers utilize strategies daily to meet learning needs of students. ▪ Teachers use data to interpret, forecast, and adjust instruction. ▪ Students receive appropriate instruction to meet their learning needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting agendas ▪ Professional development evaluation sheets ▪ Evidence of utilization of identified strategies. ▪ Classroom formative assessment data ▪ Artifacts demonstrating analysis of data ▪ E-Walk data ▪ Implementation logs ▪ Iowa Core implementation plan ▪ Building professional development agendas ▪ SREB assessments and surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development ▪ Director of Exceptional Education ▪ Director of Assessment, Equity, and Record Services ▪ Principals 	
New teacher induction includes professional development on district initiatives including status and expectations of SINA/DINA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New teachers understand and apply district initiatives. ▪ New teachers understand expectations of SINA/DINA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey, observation and other data will be collected to monitor progress. Teacher portfolio will be monitored. ▪ Professional development evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development 	
Provide core and summer intervention programs for targeted students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teachers guide students in intensive instruction of concepts and skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student achievement data ▪ Follow-up study of program effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development 	
Intervention time is provided to students to meet their needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased student understanding and achievement as intervention time is provided for reading and math. ▪ Teachers use identified strategies with targeted students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment data ▪ Building master schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors ▪ Principals 	
Determine effectiveness of reading and math core and intervention programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased student achievement as programs are delivered with integrity. ▪ Effective core and intervention programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program reports ▪ Student achievement data ▪ Formative and summative data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Assessment, Equity, and Record Services ▪ Director of Curriculum and 	

	are sustained.		Staff Development	
Content-area/instructional coaches provide building-level support of program implementation and monitoring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teachers implement reading and math programs with fidelity. ▪ Administrators monitor program implementation. ▪ Programming provides students opportunities to meet standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting agendas/notes ▪ Student achievement data ▪ E-walk data ▪ Program data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development ▪ Principals 	
Action #5: Coherent System	Changes/Impact on Stakeholders	Data Collected to Inform Change	Alignment and Responsibilities	Monitoring & Adjustment
Purposefully plan and monitor the implementation of the DINA plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student achievement increases as fidelity of instruction improves. ▪ Students benefit from appropriate placement in reading and math interventions. ▪ Administrators and teachers routinely access and use data to make appropriate instructional and resource decisions. ▪ Student support systems communicate and support high expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diagnostic test data ▪ Student achievement data ▪ Placement criteria ▪ Program implementation guidelines ▪ Intervention rosters ▪ Formative assessment data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Directors ▪ Director of Curriculum & Staff Development ▪ Director of Exceptional Education ▪ Principals 	
Action #6: Sustaining Actions for Reading and Math	Changes/Impact on Stakeholders	Data Collected to Inform Change	Alignment and Responsibilities	Monitoring & Adjustment
Review and analyze previous year's formative and summative data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct analysis of data to make informed decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thorough analysis of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instructional Support Team 	
Determine focus of adjustments as indicated by data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear targets are identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analyzed data ▪ Clear goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instructional Support Team 	
Reflect on reading and math program data; identify plan of action to sustain successful programming.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next steps are based on data and research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instructional Support Team 	

Provide professional development designed to increase student achievement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A timeline and responsibility chart is identified to ensure implementation of actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Timeline and assigned responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instructional Support Team 	
--	--	--	--	--

Projected Professional Development for Administrators and Staff - 2010-2012:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Focus</i>
Quarterly	Varies	District Initiative for Achievement (Iowa Core and Differentiated Instruction)
Monthly	Varies	Reading Specialists
Monthly	Varies	Instructional/Content Coaches
September 9 and 23; October 19, 20 and 21; November 12 and 19; January 20 and 27; March 1	Varies	Data Teams
Fall 2010 and On-going	Varies	Response to Intervention
Monthly	Varies	SREB Key Practices (MMGW/HSTW)
Monthly	Varies	Co-Teaching
Monthly	Varies	New Teacher Induction

Instructional Support Team Membership for 2010-2011:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Role</i>
Julio Almanza	Superintendent
Leslie O'Melia	Executive Director of Administrative Services
Ethel Reynolds	Executive Director of Administrative Services
Patty Pace-Tracey	Director of Exceptional Education
Gary Sloat	Director of Learning Information Services
Dawn Anderson-Rascher	Director of Assessment, Equity and Record Services
Juli Staszewski	Director of Curriculum & Staff Development
Tom Wagner	Associate Director of Learning Information Services
Betty Long	Director of Federal Programs

District Leadership Team Meeting Dates and Times for 2010-2011:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Focus</i>
September 15, 2010	8:30 am to 9:30 am	Monitor implementation of plan.
November 10, 2010	8:30 am to 9:30 am	Monitor implementation of plan.
January 19, 2011	8:30 am to 9:30 am	Monitor implementation of plan.
March 30, 2011	8:30 am to 9:30 am	Monitor implementation of plan.

Charting the Actions

Action	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Summer	2011-2012	
Action #1: Notification of Parents and Community													
Public notification following guidelines provided by Iowa Department of Education.	X												
Action # 2: Audit, Diagnosis, and Design													
Completion of Audit	X												
Completion of Diagnosis	X												
Completion of Action Plan	X												
Communication of Action Plan	X	X	X										
Action #3: Leadership													
Cultivate a shared vision of quality instruction based on Iowa Core and best practices.	X	→											
Develop a culture that meets the needs of each and every child through Response to Intervention (RTI).	X	→											
Establish data teams to review data and make recommendations for instruction and professional development.	X	→											

Action	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Summer	2011-2012
Implement an accountability system that defines expectations and monitors fidelity of implementation of identified strategies to impact student learning. This includes walk-through training for building leadership teams.	X											
Action # 4: Instruction												
Provide professional development on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response to Intervention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Data Analysis ◦ Intervention Strategies/Software ◦ Sheltered Instruction ▪ Iowa Core <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Characteristics of Effective Instruction ◦ Differentiated Instruction ▪ Co-Teaching ▪ Key practices of MMGW/HSTW 	X											
New teacher induction includes professional development on district initiatives including status and expectations of SINA/DINA.	X											

Action	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Summer	2011-2012
Provide core and summer intervention programs for targeted students.											X	
Intervention time is provided to students to meet their needs.	X	→										→
Determine effectiveness of reading and math core and intervention programs.	X	→										
Content-area/instructional coaches provide building-level support of program implementation and monitoring.	X	→										
Action #5: Coherent System												
Purposefully plan and monitor the implementation of the DINA plan	X	→										
Action #6: Sustaining Actions for Reading and Math												
Review and analyze previous year's formative and summative data.												→
Determine focus of adjustments as indicated by data.												→
Reflect on reading and math program data; identify plan of action to sustain successful programming.												→
Provide professional development designed to increase student achievement.												→

