



Sioux City Community Schools

**Comprehensive School Improvement
Plan**

2004-2009
Revised July, 2006

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

Sub-Question A: What data do we collect?

The district collects the following required data :(LRDA1)

- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED reading and mathematics at grades 4,8, & 11
- Trend line data from ITBS/ITED science for grades 8 & 11
- Graduation rate data
- Grades 7-12 dropout data (aggregated and by subgroups)
- Percentage of graduates planning to pursue postsecondary education
- Percentage of graduates completing the core curriculum (4 yrs English, 3 yrs math, science & social studies)
- Percentage of high school students achieving an ACT score indicating probable success at the postsecondary level
- Data from a district developed science assessment (grades 8&11)
- Participation rates on district wide assessments for grades 3-8 & 11
- Trend line data from the NWEA Level Test for grades 3-8 in reading, mathematics and language arts
- Trend line data from the Iowa Youth Survey and Siouxland CARES survey
(SDF1, SDF3, SDF4)

These data have been used to establish biennium trend lines, which are updated annually and reported in our Annual Progress Report. Using ITBS/ITED assessment results we also monitor the progress of student groups and subgroups over time. **(LDRA1)**

The required list of data items shown above do not provide a complete picture of our students' learning needs. Therefore we have chosen to also collect and analyze the following information: **(LRDA3, LDRA4)**

- Aggregate and subgroup attendance data
- Basic Reading Inventory Data (grades 1-3)
- Parental Survey data (2002) **(LC3)**
- Community Survey done in May 2004 **(LC3)**
- Student Survey with students in grades 3-12 conducted in the spring 2004
- Enrollment trends (Aggregate & subgroups)
- Parent Teacher Conference Attendance
- Intermediate Hearing data (Aggregate/subgroups) **(SDF2, SDF3)**
- Disciplinary Report data (Aggregate/subgroups) **(SDF2, SDF3)**
- School Culture Survey completed by teachers in the spring of 2004
- Annual report compiled by the Talented & Gifted Program
- ITBS/ITED data from grades 3,5,6,7, & 9
- District developed 10th Grade Reading Assessment
- Accident Reports
- District Advisory Committee Report on Parents as Partners
- Governor's Task Force Report

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

Administrative Cabinet

The directors of the Sioux City Community schools meet on the 2nd and 4th Tuesday of the month with the superintendent, the assistant superintendent and a representative from Western Hills AEA. On the 4th Tuesday of the month 3 principals, one from each of the following levels, elementary, middle school, and high school join the meeting. The Cabinet regularly reviews and discusses various district programs, assessment data, and district goals. Information regarding the implementation of programs is also shared and analyzed. Current program data and possible future initiatives are considered in light of current district goals.

No Child Left Behind Team

The NCLB team is made up of the directors of Secondary Education, Elementary Education, Equity, Special Education, Assessment, Technology, Reading First Grant and the assistant superintendent. They meet on the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of the month. This team regularly analyzes data compiled about district programs and student needs. All of the directors previously listed bring data and information to the table for review and analysis.

Cabinet Retreat

The administrative cabinet annually holds a retreat for the purpose of analyzing data and setting goals for the coming school year. This year the 3.5-day retreat was used to analyze the district data listed in sub-question response 1A. Four head teachers from the core areas of reading, mathematics, and science joined the group during the latter part of the retreat. The retreat was extended this year to include several shorter work sessions. During these shorter work sessions student needs were developed and prioritized, plans were made for meeting those needs and evaluation systems to be used to measure program success were developed.

Building Leadership Teams (BLT)

Each building in the district has a BLT. The BLT is made up of the principal, one teacher or counselor from the building and an outside facilitator (someone not from the building). The BLT is responsible for attending district level meetings held 5 times during the school year. BLT team members learn about data analysis, implementation of district professional development, and other district level initiatives. The BLT then takes this information back to the building to share with the building High Achievement Team (HAT). The BLT team also brings information from the buildings to be shared with other BLT teams and district leadership.

High Achievement Team (HAT)

Each building in the district has a HAT team made up of the members of the BLT and four other members of the building staff. The role of the HAT is to plan, coordinate and

conduct building meetings on professional development and data analysis. The HAT gathers ITBS/ITED and Level Test data for analysis. An item analysis of the ITBS/ITED results is coordinated and conducted. Other student data (attendance, tardies, disciplinary reports & implementation data) are also compiled and analyzed. The HAT Team uses both aggregated and disaggregated data. The HAT team is also instrumental in developing the building improvement plan.

District Assessment Team

A district level assessment team meets monthly to give feedback to the assessment director regarding the planning and coordination of district-wide assessments. This team also analyzes and discusses a piece of data at each of its meetings. The assessment team includes the Director of Assessment, the Directors of Elementary Education and Secondary Education, the Director of Special Education, the head teachers from the language arts, math, and science departments and one principal from elementary, middle and high schools.

Principal Meetings and Head Teacher Meetings

The district principals meet monthly as do the head teachers from each subject area department. Data analysis is a regular piece of their meeting. Data, both aggregated and disaggregated, is brought to them for discussion and feedback.

District Advisory Committee

District and building information is annually reviewed by the District Advisory Committee. Examples of data typically discussed by this committee are: student achievement data, enrollment data, class size data and dropout data. Other data is reviewed and analyzed as needed. This committee annually makes recommendations to the Board of Education. Their annual report is presented to the board near the end of each school year.

District Equity Committee

This committee also meets monthly to discuss topics relating to equity issues within the district. Typically this committee reviews and analyzes student enrollment trends, course enrollment data, student achievement data, class size information, revised curriculum, and other related matters. The Equity Committee annually reports to the Board of Education their findings and recommendations.

Governor's Task Force on Achievement Gap

Sioux City was one of two school districts in the state that was commissioned by Governor Vilsak to analyze data related to achievement gap between majority students and minority students. The Task Force also examined the effects of poverty on achievement.

This committee has made recommendations to the Governor on how to close the achievement gap. Their report will also be given to the Sioux City Community School District Board of Education.

Board of Education

The Board of Education holds a work session each July for the purpose of reviewing and analyzing student achievement data. The data reviewed includes ITBS/ITED results (aggregated and disaggregated), NWEA Level Test results and other student data related to achievement. The Board plays an active role in the analysis of data. Further, the Board gives recommendation to the administration of future actions needed based on this analysis.

Sub-Question C: What did we learn through this data analysis?

Through the analysis of the building and district data the following was learned:

(LDRA1, LDRA2, LDRA3, LDRA4)

- The white and Asian-American subgroups typically score higher than the other racial ethnic subgroups.
- An achievement gap is discernable when comparing low SES students to students who are not low SES.
- The reading and math scores of our students begin to decline slightly beginning in the 5th grade and do not begin to rise again until the 9th grade.
- The achievement gaps previously mentioned exist in both reading and math.
- The trend line for middle school achievement scores is flat or slightly in decline when viewed as an aggregated group and for disaggregated subgroups.
- An upward trend in 4th grade reading and math scores is beginning to happen.
- African-Americans, while being a stable population in the community for years, achieve at a much lower rate than white students in reading and math.
- Tutoring seems to be one of the reasons for Native American gains in achievement scores.
- The achievement level scores for individual school buildings vary widely.
- We need to build stronger relationships with parents and students.
- Our students at all grade levels need help with reading comprehension especially with interpretations, inferencing, generalizations and evaluation.
- Our scores are comparable with other districts of similar size and with like subgroup populations in the state.
- Approximately 25% of our students do not feel welcome and/or safe at school. (Also, students feel less welcome the longer they are in school.)
- Teachers indicated in a survey that we need to set high expectations for all students.
- Improvement in achievement scores for Native Americans between grades 8 and 11 may be due to the dropout rate.

- Our graduation rate is improving; dropout rate is falling.
- Our students of color are more often going to an intermediate hearing for discipline than their percent of total population. **(SDF2, SDF4)**
- We have higher dropout rates among African-American students, Hispanic students, and Native American students than would reasonably be expected.
- Use of illegal substances increases between 6th and 8th grades. **(SDF4)**
- The special education subgroup has a lower than average attendance rate and a higher than average dropout rate as compared to our non-special education group.
- The ELL subgroup is not showing needed progress in raising the level of students proficient in reading and math.
- Only about half of the seniors planning to attend post secondary education take four years of English and three years of math, science and social studies.
- Students feel there is a lack of respect among their peers.

Sub-Question D: From the data analysis, what are our prioritized student needs?

Based on our data review, we have developed the following list of prioritized needs:

- Improve reading comprehension for all students with particular focus on:
 - Low SES (K-12)
 - Hispanic students (K-12)
 - Native American students (K-12)
 - African-American students (K-12)
 - Special Education students (K-12)
 - ELL students (K-12)
 - All students in grades 5-8
- Improve math performance for students in all grade levels, again with particular attention given to students mentioned in previous bullet point
- Improve the learning environment for our students (K-12)
- Improve our attendance rate (K-12)
- Improve the district graduation rate
- Increase parental involvement in schools at all levels

Sub-Question E: How will we develop goals and actions based upon prioritized needs?

The No Child Left Behind Team uses the prioritized list of students needs to recommend goal statements to the Board for adoption. The district leadership in collaboration with the BLT teams and community stakeholders will adopt research base strategies and actions that align with and support the established goals.

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

Sub-Question A: What long-range goals have been established to support prioritized student needs?

Based upon recommendations of the District Advisory Committee and the Administrative Cabinet, the school board has adopted district goals aligned with student needs. (LC5)

District Student Learning Goals

Sioux City's student learning goals are the general expectations for all its graduates. Students graduating from the Sioux City Community School District will be able to do the following: (LC6)

- Be **effective communicators** who read, write, listen and respond to the messages and ideas of others, who generate ideas and relate information in various contexts, and who demonstrate fluency in written and oral English.
- Be **collaborative individuals** who use reasonable social, group, and leadership skills to develop and manage interpersonal relationships within a variety of cultural and organizational settings.
- Be **problem solvers** who identify problems, use strategies, and apply mathematical, logical, critical and creative reasoning to solve problems and make responsible decisions.
- Be **technological practitioners**, who use advanced technologies, including but not limited to the computer, to create, access, integrate and use information in a variety of contexts.
- Be **resourceful/goal-oriented learners** who create a positive vision of themselves and their future, view themselves as lifelong learners, set priorities and achievable goals, create options for themselves, monitor and evaluate their progress.
- Be **quality workers** who demonstrate a strong work ethic and create and/or appreciate intellectual, artistic, practical and physical services or products, which reflect originality and high standards.
- Be **life managers** who demonstrate the motivation and skills necessary to persevere, make wise decisions, and accept responsibility for actions that contribute to self and society.

District Long-Range Goals

Sioux City's long-range goals define the desired targets to be reached over an extended period of time. These long-range goals serve two purposes; 1) to meet locally determined student needs goals and 2) to address state and federal student accountability.

Goal 1: All K-12 students will achieve at the proficient level 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 subgroups.
- 1b. Percentage of students in grades 1-3 who are independent readers at grade level on the Basic Reading Inventory (BRI).
- 1c. Percentage of students in grades 4 and 8 who achieve at grade level or above on the NWEA Level Test in Reading.

Goal 2: All K-12 students will achieve at the proficient level 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 Test in grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Mathematics Test in grade 11, including data disaggregated by subgroups.
- 2b. Percentage of students in grades 4 and 8 who achieve at grade level expectations or above on the NWEA Level Test in Math.

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

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 grade 8 and the ITED Science Test in grade 11, including data disaggregated by subgroup.
- 3b. Percentage of students in grades 8 and 11 who achieve at the proficient level or above on the district developed science assessment.

Goal 4: All K-12 students will use technology in developing proficiency in reading, math, 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 who score at the proficient level or above on the locally developed technology assessment.

Goal 5: All schools will maintain a school climate that is safe, orderly and conducive to academic productivity for all students.

The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 5.

- 5a. Average daily attendance

- 5b. Graduation rate as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education using data from the spring BEDS report.
- 5c. Percentage of student body that receives any discipline referrals (i.e., office referrals, suspensions, and expulsions). (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 triennial Iowa Youth Survey and the annual Siouxland Cares Youth Survey. (SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)
- 5e. Percentage of students indicating they feel safe at school from the School Culture Survey. (SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)
- 5f. Percentage of students who are seen in intermediate disciplinary hearings. (SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)

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

The people most impacted by our goals had a voice in determining how to meet them. As a result, the No Child Left Behind Team, the District Advisory Committee, and Building Leadership Teams will identify stakeholder groups most directly impacted, and they met to determine actions and strategies to meet the goals. Additionally, because one of our elementary schools was identified as a School in Need of Assistance (SINA), we will be working closely with the Statewide Support System for Schools in Need of Assistance—the SINA Support Team. Our district will use the Iowa Professional Development Model process to develop its District Career Development Plan and an action research design to guide conversations and assist making goal progress. As actions are developed to support each goal, implementation plans will be developed at the appropriate levels (e.g., elementary, middle school, and high school) to provide K-12 system alignment of efforts.

Sub-Question C: What is our current practice to support these long-range goals?

The following programs and strategies are used with both regular education students and special education students.

1. Instructional Strategies Currently Used in the District
 - Cooperative learning
 - Think Alouds
 - Questioning strategies
 - Explicit instruction
 - Reciprocal teaching
 - Leveled reading groups (K-7)
 - Hands-on science (K-8)
 - Inquiry-based science (K-8)
 - Graphic organizers
 - APL Elements of Effective Teaching (K-12)
 - Flexible small group instruction
 - Standards-based instruction
 - Collaborative learning
 - Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM)

- Kansas University Strategies
- Manipulators in math (K-3)
- TEACCH (Treatment and Education of Austistic and Related Communication Handicap Children)

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

- District Career Development Plan (Professional Development Program K-12)
- At-risk Program/Services through Allowable Growth
- Gifted and Talented Program/Services (TAG) (K-12)
- Special Education Program/Services (preK-12)
- Teacher Mentoring and Induction Program
- Alternative High School (9-12)
- PLATO (Reading and math through technology at grades 4 and 8)
- Student Assistance Team/Social Health Team (preK-12)
- Student service partnerships e.g., mental health services and community health services (preK-12)
- Reading Recovery (1st grade)
- Technology-based reading, mathematics and science programs
- Perkins: Vocational and Technical Education Programs (9-12)
- Title I, Part A: Reading Program/Services (1-6)
- Title II, Part D: Technology Usage
- Title III, Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students (K-12)
- Title IV: Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program/Services
- After school programs (Beyond the Bell; 21st Century Grant)
- Academic Enhancement Centers (9-12)
- Mentors in Violence Prevention
- English as a Second Language Program
- Teaming at 9th grade
- Night school (9-12)
- D.A.R.E.
- Summer School (K-12)
- Peer tutoring
- Character Education/Character Counts (K-5)
- Iowa Jobs for American Graduates
- Reconnecting Youth
- Resource officers
- Accelerated Reader
- Parent Education on substance abuse and safety
- Reading First
- Title I, Part C: Migrant Programs
- Outreach workers
- Title VII Indian Education

- Transition Alliance Program (TAP)
 - Anti-bullying (PATHS)
3. System-wide Management Supports Currently Used in the District
- Resource allocation (e.g., financial and personnel)
 - Technology (e.g., data management system and infrastructure)
 - Policy development
 - Personnel evaluation systems (including administrators, teachers, and paraeducators)
 - Curriculum development
 - Iowa Technical Adequacy Project (ITAP) (curriculum-assessment alignment)
 - Leadership for CSIP implementation and planning
 - Waivers for professional development
 - District-directed professional development
 - Leadership (BLT) (HAT)
 - Assessment support
 - Grant opportunities and applications
 - Equity resources (financial and departmental)

Sub-Question D: 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 student results. We relied upon the Iowa Content Area Networks, 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 related to the goal areas. These practices include the following:

Reading: Cooperative learning strategies applied to reading
 Think Alouds
 Explicit instruction
 Reciprocal teaching
 Reading Recovery
 Flexible small group instruction
 PLATO Technology
 Read Alouds
 Questioning skills
 Kurzweil Program
 PWIM

Mathematics: Cooperative learning strategies applied to mathematics content
 Computations strategies
 PLATO Technology

Manipulatives
Questioning skills
Problem Solving Strategies

Science: Inquiry based instruction
Hands-on science

Climate: MVP—Mentors in Violence Prevention
Conflict Resolution Teaming
Character Education/Character Counts
REACH (Respecting Ethnic and Cultural Heritage)

Research Needed. The Professional Development Committee and the No Child Left Behind Team is responsible for collecting and reviewing the literature base on practices in reading, math, science, technology and environment. These two groups will establish timelines within the next five years for each of the following areas:

Reading: **(AMN1)** Cooperative Learning strategies applied to reading content
Adolescent Literacy
Think Alouds

Math: **(AMN2)** Cooperative Learning strategies applied to math content
Problem Solving
Comprehensive strategies in math classroom

Science: **(AMN3)** Cooperative Learning strategies applied to science content

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

Climate: Cooperative Learning
Smaller learning communities **(AR7)**
Middle school concept
Relationship building **(AR7)**
Attendance **(AR7)**

Program/Services Current Practice. These committees will also use a goal-oriented approach to program evaluation (clear expectations, results data, and targeted program/service evaluation) to determine program effectiveness relative to CSIP goals and other program goals.

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

Curriculum/Assessment Alignment. We have developed standards and benchmarks in language arts, mathematics and science. Over the past two years, we have focused on aligning our reading and math curriculum. We have completed an alignment review of our

reading and math curriculie with district-wide assessments using the Iowa Technical Adequacy Process (ITAP). We need to use the ITAP process to insure proper alignment of our science standards and benchmarks and assessments.

Reading Instruction. When looking at our reading strategies we discover that more work needs to be done at the secondary level, especially the high school level. The research base needs to be examined to find best practices for secondary students so we can implement them.

Technology. As we move forward with assessing student skills in technology during their 8th grade year, it will become necessary to restructure some of our high school course offerings. We will need to study what may need to be done and then review the research base for direction.

Science Instruction. We have begun the implementation of an inquiry-based science program and hands-on science kits. Most of the work thus far has focused on grades K-8. Work needs to be done on moving this model into grades 9-12. Also, cooperative learning strategies need to be applied to science instruction.

Instructional Strategy Decisions. In reviewing our instructional practices we determined that some of them do not have a strong research base. Within the next five years, we must address the following two issues:

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

Cooperative Learning. Cooperative learning has been used in the Sioux City Schools for a number of years. However, as we examine its current usage across the district, we noted that it lacks the consistency, frequency, and fidelity necessary to be highly effective. The literature base for cooperative learning is solid. We will collect implementation data on cooperative learning and then move forward to what needs to be done to implement cooperative learning across the K-12 arena with consistency, frequency, and fidelity.

Mathematics Instruction. The research base in mathematics indicates that student achievement will improve if instruction is problem-centered. Current practice in mathematics does not reflect these strategies; as a result, these strategies will be part of our district career development plan. Further, we need to look into using reading comprehension strategies in the math classroom especially at the middle and high school levels.

Climate. The Sioux City Community Schools currently use a variety of research-based practices in working to provide a safe and welcoming environment for students. Some of the programs currently being used are mentoring, character education and anti-bullying (PATHS). However, we note a gap in effective programming to aid in the reduction of disciplinary incidences, tardies, absenteeism, and dropouts. We will be exploring the

research for effective programs to be introduced and implemented into our schools over the next five years.

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

Actions for CSIP Goals 1-4

- 1. Implement the district career development plan. (AMN1, AMN2, AMN3, IEI1, PERK1, SPED1, TQ7)** Our district career development plan describes professional development efforts aligned with prioritized student needs. The plan will target the following areas: reading comprehension, math problem solving, differentiated instructional strategies, cooperative learning, curriculum planning, assessment, and student interventions. Our district will focus on participation in four K-12 State sponsored initiatives – Struggling Readers, Every Student Counts (math), Every Learner Inquires (science), and Reading First. These PD targets align with our long-range goals 1, 2 and 3 (**PD6, TQ1, TQ2**). The learning and implementing of these researched-based strategies will increase student achievement. (**TQ3, TQ4, LEP1, FTP3**)

Research-based Strategies. Each of the instructional strategies that have been selected are scientifically researched based. Our Professional Development Committee has conducted a review of the literature and defined a list of criteria that ensures a quality research base. The criteria includes:

- a) Evidence of positive student results demonstrated by research that employed systematic empirical methods and
- b) Research studies that demonstrate rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures that are reliable, valid and relevant to educational activities and programs. (**PD5, SDF9**)

Participation. All teachers will be engaged in training, including those responsible for Title I, Special Education, At-Risk, ELL, and Gifted and Talented. Central office and building administrators will also be actively involved. AEA 12 will assist us by offering licensure renewal credits for professional development activities and classes. This will create an incentive for teachers and administrators to further participate in the district's career development plan and to implement new strategies at the classroom level. (**PERK1, SPED1, LEP1, TQ8**)

Professional Development Content. Beginning with 2004-2005 school year, professional instructional staff will implement the following instructional strategies and supports: (**FTP2, FTP4, FTP5**)

- Every Student Counts initiatives through State of Iowa (K-8)
- Technology integration into classrooms (K-12)
- Every Learner Inquires
- Differentiated Instructional strategies (i.e., flex grouping; small group instruction)

- Cooperative Learning
- Cultural Competency
- Co-teaching
- Reading First
- E2T2
- Rigor, Relevance & Relationship Lessons

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

- Standard #2 Demonstrates competence in content knowledge (specifically for criteria 2a, 2b, and 2d)
- Standard #3 Demonstrates competence in planning and preparation for instruction (specifically criteria 3a, 3b, 3d, and 3e)
- Standard #4 Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meet the multiple learning needs of students (specifically criteria 4a, 4b, and 4f)
- Standard #7 Professional Development (specifically criteria 7a, 7b, 7c, and 7d)
- Two days of PD prior to the start of the school year. One day of departmental PD and one day of building level PD.
- On 33 Mondays students will be released 1 hour early. Teachers, counselors and administrators will be engaged in PD activities for 1-2 hours. These will be used as follows: 7 sessions for ICDP work; 4 sessions for department PD (secondary); 22 sessions for building-based PD
- One full day of PD in January will be split between department meetings and building-based meetings.
- Monthly meetings of the PD team (planning; analyzing data)
- Weekly structured collaboration by teachers.
- BLT team meetings focus on planning/delivery of PD.
- Elementary Cadre meetings will be held 18 times throughout the school year for Reading First buildings and 12 times for non-Reading First buildings. Cadre meetings will be for a teacher leader and principal from each building. Meetings will focus on district-directed instructional strategies, curriculum, interventions and assessment to be delivered through building-based PD.

Professional Development Providers. (TQ6) Our professional development providers for reading and math will be local teachers and AEA staff.

2. Enhance instructional materials and resources.

- Continue to purchase books, technology and other materials in all curricular areas that will aid us in reaching our goals.
- Implement student performance and data organization tool.

3. Provide support that will address the learning needs of all students with special focus given to students in the following subgroups: African-American, Hispanic, Native American, Low SES, Special Education and ELL. (AR7)

- Implement a program for bi-weekly progress checks on students not mastering the core objectives in reading and math.
- Plan and implement additional support for students not mastering necessary reading and math skills (tutoring, additional instructional time, new courses).
- Actively engage parents as partners in their child's education.
- Seek additional, active community support for educational issues (i.e., employer check on student's grades, attendance and tardies).
- Setting higher standards for student achievement at all grade levels (i.e., courses successfully completed by certain benchmark years).
- Development of positive relationships with students and parents through the use of encouragement and listening skills.
- Actively seek to prepare and enroll more students of color in upper level courses
- Add an advanced literature course to the middle school curriculum and a reading course in grade 9
- Assess the readiness of incoming kindergarteners and provide a summer Pre-K readiness program

4. Provide supports that will address CTE (Career and Technical Education) students' achievement in reading and mathematics.

- Integrate reading and math skill development into the career and technical education curriculum. (PERK1)

Actions for CSIP Goal 5

1. Support students and families in order to increase student participation, attendance, and graduation.

- Continue to develop a culturally proficient climate in all buildings and district.
- Continue alternative education supports for at-risk students at the elementary and middle school (AR7)
- Continue implementation of an electronic student record keeping system that includes performance tasks for monitoring progress toward proficiency and graduation requirements
- Institute a follow-up procedure with parents at all levels when chronic absenteeism is a concern. Increase parent contacts through family interviews, home visits and referrals to the truancy officer.

2. Create a learning environment that is safe, supportive, and conducive to learning.

- Develop and implement a program to increase parental involvement in the schools
- Increase the number of buildings using the anti-bullying curriculum PATHS (SDF9, AR7)
- Design and implement a program in middle school to help decrease the incidence of illegal substance use. (SDF9, AR7)

Sub-Question G: How will we support implementation of the identified actions?

We will devise implementation plans for the actions previously described for CSIP goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. 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

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

Sub-Question A: How will we know student learning has changed over time in relation to our long-range goals?

The Sioux City Community School District will use multiple data sources to determine if student learning has changed, including a combination of district-wide standardized assessments, grade level and classroom assessments, and perceptual data (e.g., surveys). The building BLT/HAT Teams will ensure that data from these assessment measures are collected, analyzed, and shared with the District Professional Development Committee as outlined in Question 1B. 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 (see Question #2A), Sioux City will monitor progress on its long-range goals through analysis of aggregate and disaggregated trend line data from the following sources:

- ITBS reading comprehension and mathematics total tests at grades 3-8, and the science test at grades 5 and 8 (Goals #1-4)
- ITED reading comprehension, mathematics, and science tests at grade 11 (Goals #1-4)
- BRI Test at grades 1-3 (Goal #1) **(DWAP3, DWAP4, DWAP6)**
- NWEA Level Tests for reading and math in grades 3-8 (Goals #1-2) **(DWAP7)**
- District Developed Science Assessment at grades 4, 8, and 11 (Goal #3) **(DWAP8)**
- District Developed Technology Assessment at grade 8 (Goal #4)
- Attendance data from district's student information management system (Goal #5)
- District graduation data as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education (based on the spring BEDS report) (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 and Siouxland Cares Survey

- The percentage of students that receives a discipline referral (i.e., office referral, suspension, and/or expulsion) (Goal #5)

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

To make certain that the assessments used to monitor progress on long-range achievement goals are aligned with the district’s curriculum, Sioux City completed the Iowa Technical Adequacy Project (ITAP) process for the ITBS, TTED, and NWEA Level Tests. Through completion of this process, the district found that it was necessary to revisit its reading and mathematics standards and benchmarks. Some minor adjustments in wording were made to these 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 Sioux City Schools:

- Professional Development for teachers and principals (e.g., District Career Development Plan and Title II, Part A)
- Supplemental reading and mathematics services for eligible students (e.g., Title I, Part A)
- Use of technology to improve student achievement (e.g., Title II, Part D)
- Programs and services to assist English Language Learners (Title III, Part A)
- Drug and violence prevention programs (Title IV, Part A)
- Early intervention programs for grades K-3
- K-12 At-Risk program
- K-12 gifted and talented program (TAG)
- Special Education services
- Career and Technical Education programs (CTE)

Additional Data Gathering and Analysis

To help provide a more complete picture of student learning needs. Sioux City will continue to monitor the following data sources:

- All data points included in the district’s Annual Progress Report (APR)
- The percentage of students who participate in district-wide assessment
- Student performance on the NWEA Level Tests reading assessment at grades 3-8 and 10
- Annual cohort performance from grade 3 through grade 11 as measured by the ITBS and ITED in the areas of reading, mathematics, science, and social studies
- 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, Siouxland Cares Survey and the District Climate Survey
- IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) for English Language Learners to measure ELL students’ English proficiency (**LEP2**)

- Phonological Awareness Test Results (K-2 grades)
- BRI Results (grades 1-5)
- ELDA Test Results (K-12)

Future Data Gathering

Sioux City is aware that it will need to collect additional information to allow for more informed evaluation of programs and services. Currently, the district plans to add the following measures:

During the 2004-05 school year:

- Cognitive Abilities Test for grade 3 to be used by the TAG department for placement
- A new assessment for technology proficiency for grade 8

During the 2008-09 school year:

- Update edition of the NWEA Math Tests for grades 3-8

During the 2007-08 school year:

- NWEA Level Test for science in grades 3-8

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

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

Goal-Oriented Approach to Program Evaluation

Sioux City has adopted a goal-oriented approach to formally evaluate the programs and services it offers to meet prioritized student needs as identified in its CSIP. **(ECSIP1)** This goal-oriented approach to program evaluation includes the following components:

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

A specific process has been developed for the evaluation of the District Career Development Plan. It includes the following elements:

- An analysis of student achievement data (aggregated/disaggregated) in reading comprehension and math total as measured by ITBS/ITED grades 3-8; 11 (Fall)
- An analysis of student achievement data in reading and math from NWEA Level Tests grades 3-8; 10 (Fall; Spring)
- An analysis of implementation data collected and analyzed by building BLTs (Spring)
- Collection and analysis of data will occur as it becomes available to help discern the effects of Professional Development programming on student achievement
- Annually all data collected will be brought together and analyzed by the Professional Development Committee

Sioux City will use a combination of formative and summative evaluation processes within the program evaluation process. The district will also determine the frequency of the formative and summative evaluation processes for each of the programs/services by two factors: 1) legal mandates and 2) local data. At a minimum, an in-depth formal summative evaluation for all of the programs that Sioux City incorporates into its CSIP will occur within a five-year rotation. Note: We will submit any required annual evaluations/reports for state and federal programs.

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

Program	In-Depth Program Evaluation Rotation
Professional Development Program (District Career Development Plan)	Annually, beginning in 2005 (TQ10, TQ11)
Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training/Recruiting) Note: Title II, Part A is embedded into Sioux City's district career development plan	Annually, beginning in 2005 (TPTR1)
Title I, Part A (Parent Involvement)	Annually, beginning in 2005 (TITL1)
Title II, Part D	Every two years, beginning in 2005 (PTP6)
Title IV (Safe and Drug Free Schools)	Every three years, beginning in 2005 (SDF10)
Mentoring and Induction Program	Every three years, beginning in 2006 (TQ9)
Title III (Language Instruction for LEP Students)	Every two years, beginning in 2006 (LEP3)
Talented and Gifted Program	Every five years, beginning in 2007 (GT2)
Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Educational Programs)	Every five years, beginning in 2007 (PERK2, PERK3)
At-Risk Program	Every five years, beginning in 2008 (AR4)
Special Education Programs and Services	Every five years, beginning in 2008 (ESPE1, ESPE2)

Sioux City will collect formative evaluation data for each program on an annual basis. However, the district will collect data regarding some programs, such as the Professional Development Program (District Career Development Plan), more frequently. Progress toward meeting program/service expectations will be reported to the District Administrative Cabinet, the Board of Education, and the public.

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

CSIP Indicator Data to Measure Program Effectiveness

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

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

Additional Indicator Data to Measure Program Effectiveness

The district decided that it needs additional information to determine the effectiveness of some of its programs. In addition to the indicator data associated with the CSIP goals listed in Sioux City's Constant Conversation Question #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, TRTR1)

- Percentage of faculty responsible for instruction who participate in district and building career development opportunities
- Percentage of K-12 teachers who accurately use the strategies as measured by observation and implementation logs

- Percentage of K-12 teachers who document technology usage in their implementation logs

Gifted and Talented Program (GT2)

Rather than judging the effectiveness of its Gifted and Talented Program through CSIP goal indicators, since Sioux City does not believe that disaggregating its district-wide assessment data by gifted and talented student participants provides meaningful information, Sioux City is going to use the following indicator to determine the effectiveness of its Gifted and Talented Program:

- Percentage of students of color served in the Gifted and Talented Program
- Success in meeting annual program goals, as stated in the TAG Annual Program Improvement Plan, in the following areas: technology, social-emotional, achievement

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

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

Mentoring and Induction Program (TQ9)

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

Special Education Programs and Services (ESPE1)

- Percentage of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who become proficient in math and reading comprehension
- Percent of special education students who graduate
- Average Daily Attendance of special education students

Title I, Part A, Parental Involvement (TITL1)

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

Title III (LEP3)

- Percentage of ELL students who are proficient in English
- Percentage of ELL students demonstrating proficiency in reading and math as measured by district-wide assessments