Indiana Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS
Division of Title I

District Improvement/Action Plan Template—Year 1

____West Noble School Corporation_____	_6065_____	_Dennis VanDuyne_____	__7/01/09__
Corporation Name	Number	Person Submitting Plan	Date

Step 1: Student groups not meeting AYP

SES - Language Arts
Hispanic – Language Arts

Complete this box only if the subgroup above is students with disabilities
Required Special Education Monitoring Indicators (all are percentages)
1. Students with disabilities participation rate on statewide assessments (PI–3; 9–10) _100%_
2. Students with disabilities not meeting AYP (PI–3) _Math 78% __ LA 91%_
3. Students with disabilities suspended or expelled (PI–4)_27%__ compared to nondisabled students _15%_
4. Students with disabilities who drop-out (PI–2, 13–14)____ compared to nondisabled students ____
5. Students with disabilities that graduate with a diploma (PI–1, 13–14)_____ compared to nondisabled students ____
5. Percentage of students with disabilities (PI–5)
   (a) removed from regular class less than 21% of day _10%_
   (b) removed from regular class greater than 60% of day _4%_
   (c) served in public or provide separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements _0%_

Step 2: Findings from disaggregated data

Findings from Disaggregating the Data

Limited English Proficiency

LEP students who are not Sp. Ed. or SES – % passing decreases for males from 3rd to 8th grades
-% passing increases for females from 3rd to 8th grades

Some LEP students have been in US schools for 6 years and are still testing at level two.

While students might pass at any levels, most need to be at level 4 to have a good probability of passing

Findings from Disaggregating the Data

Special Education
55 Special Education students had 274 days of ISS throughout the year, missing a lot of direct instruction.

Sp. Ed. Accounts for 20% of suspensions while only being 10% of the population

Only 37% of students with speech impairments are passing ISTEP

LD students have unusually low pass rate in both LA and Math

The Special Education inclusion rates for LD students are low.
Only 17% of LD students are in general education classroom 80+% of the time.
80% of LD students are in the general education classroom 60%-79% of the time
3% of LD students are in the general education classroom less than 60% of the time

All students
Passing rate for all males in LA decreases through the grade levels
Passing rate for all males in Math remains level through grade levels

Overall passing rates decrease at 6th and 7th grade levels

Students without risk factors of LEP, SES or Sp. Ed. are below desired passing rates, especially males

Males	Females
3rd – 63% passing LA	3rd – 58% passing LA
4th – 70% passing LA	4th – 93% passing LA
5th – 72% passing LA	5th – 84% passing LA
6th – 66% passing LA	6th – 73% passing LA
7th – 70% passing LA	7th – 86% passing LA
8th – 71% passing LA	8th – 89% passing LA

Checking for Our Supports to the Students—Potential Causes of Above

Step 3: Our
a. Curriculum
b. Instruction/ interventions
c. Formative assessments/ progress monitoring
d. Professional development about CIA
e. Data-driven decision making

a. *Curriculum*: Many special needs students are not exposed to grade level curriculum
Results for students: Students are not given the opportunity to learn material and therefore have little chance to pass ISTEP

b. *Instruction/Interventions*: Consistent time for collaboration across grade levels is not available
Results for students: Gaps and repetition in curriculum are present

b. *Instruction/Interventions*: Limited support for LEP levels 3, 4
Results for students: Students are slow to progress to higher levels

b. *Instruction/Interventions*: Students expectations are set too low.
Results for students: Student perform just to expectation, no higher

b. *Instruction/Interventions*: Teachers may not know IEP well enough
Results for students: Needed modifications are not made. Expectations are incorrectly set either too high or too low.

b. *Instruction/Interventions*: Limited student engagement, motivation, and student ownership
Results for students: lower quality work and less achievement

b. *Instruction/Interventions*: Limited higher order activities. Students are working at knowledge and comprehension levels but not application, analysis and synthesis levels.
Results for students: emphasis on memorization but little practice at problem solving. Little assessment of depth of understanding.

Step 4: Action Plan Focus Areas based on Potential Causes

All children exposed to grade level materials

Set reasonable high, challenging but appropriate goals & expectations

Improve student engagement

Develop student skills at all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy

Checking for Our Supports to the Students—Potential Causes of Above

Step 3: Our a. Curriculum b. Instruction/ interventions c. Formative assessments/ progress monitoring d. Professional development about CIA e. Data-driven decision making	**c. *Formative Assessments/Progress monitoring—Data-driven decision making***: too much memorization *Results for students:* students unable to apply knowledge (ISTEP skill) **c. *Formative Assessments/Progress monitoring—Data-driven decision making***: Limited use of assessments for inform instruction *Results for students:* Students do not get the instruction they need most **c. *Formative Assessments/Progress monitoring—Data-driven decision making*:** NWEA *Results for students:* Helps monitor longer-term growth but leaves gaps for daily instruction. **c. *Formative Assessments/Progress monitoring—Data-driven decision making***: Common Assessments limited *Results for students:* Difficult for teachers to reflect on and improve teaching practices. **c. *Formative Assessments/Progress monitoring—Data-driven decision making*:** *Results for students:*	**Step 4**: Action Plan Focus Areas based on Potential Causes Improve quality of questioning Improve progress monitoring Implement pre/post testing

Step 5:
Action Plan

group not meeting AYP: __ Socio-Economic Status (SES) _____

AYP target goals for this group: This year: ____2009-2010 Increase the passing rate for SES by 5% _____

Next year: ____2010-2011 Increase the passing rate for SES by 5% _____

Focus Areas from Step 4	**C I A D**	**Research-Based Strategy to Implement**	**SMART Goals** (including timeline)	**Measure of Implementation of Goal—Measure of Impact on Student Learning**	**Person Providing Professional Development**
Improve student engagement	I	Instructional Strategies from Marzano's *Classroom Instruction that Works*	48 teachers (12 from each building), all principals, the superintendent and curriculum director will receive 36 hours of training in the instructional strategies. Training will occur at intervals of about one day per month for 6 months.	Number of teachers trained and sessions completed	Instructional strategies coach
Develop student skills at all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy	I			Common assessments showing development at all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy	
Improve progress monitoring & Implement pre/post testing	A D			Lesson plans documenting instructional changes made as a result of progress monitoring. Teacher's observation of higher student achievement	

Step 5:
Action Plan

Student subgroup not meeting AYP: __ Hispanic / Limited English Proficiency _____

AYP target goals for this group: This year: ____2009-2010 Increase the passing rate by 7% _____

Next year: ____2010-2011 Increase the passing rate by 7% _____

Focus Areas from Step 4	**C I A D**	**Research-Based Strategy to Implement**	**SMART Goals** (including timeline)	**Measure of Implementation of Goal—Measure of Impact on Student Learning**	**Person Providing Professional Development**
Improve student engagement	I	Marzano's research + Schlechty's Design Qualities that promote engagement	48 teachers (12 from each building), all principals, the superintendent and curriculum director will receive 36 hours of training in the instructional strategies. Training will occur at intervals of about one day per month for 6 months.	Records showing teachers training and sessions completed	Instructional strategies coach
				Peer observations of engagement qualities in pre/post setting	
Set reasonable high, challenging but appropriate goals & expectations	C I	"Flow" – finding correct levels of Challenge vs. skills by Csikszentmihalyi		ILP- progress on Individual learning plans	

Indiana Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

Division of Title I

Additional Requirements

1. **Reread your plan to determine that it includes the district's response to the following**:
   - *Curriculum*: as it relates to the students not meeting AYP
   - *Instruction*: research-based as it relates to the students not meeting AYP
   - *Formal assessments*: as it relates to the students not meeting AYP
   - *Use of data* to make decisions: as it relates to the students not meeting AYP

➢ If these are not clearly addressed in the plan, do so below, **as required by NCLB**:

Over the last couple years we have done extensive work on our Language Arts curriculum and believe it to be in good shape.

Instruction is an areas we have targeted for improvement.

Formal assessments will be addressed through our pre/post testing.

Use of Data relates to our improved progress monitoring. We will use data inform decisions on scheduling, re-teaching and access to interventions.

2. **Review the following topics that are also required by NCLB. If these are not addressed in the previous pages, write a short narrative in the space provided**.
   - *Extended Day, Year, or Dedicated Time During the Day***:** For students not meeting AYP (as appropriate):

All levels, elementary, middle and high school, have extended day opportunities for homework help or tutoring. During the day, the high school has double up classes which allow students not passing math to receive additional help doing their homework. There is also a learning resource room that all students may access for help form peers or staff. The middle school offers remedial math and language art instruction to supplement the regular class. The elementary schools have intervention programs in language arts for needy students.

Summer school is offered for 6 weeks for elementary students and 4 weeks for secondary students.

SES (Supplemental Educational Services are offered to Title I students.

   - *Parental Involvement:* For parents of students not meeting AYP. Do not include routine events for all parents (e.g., PTA, carnivals) or those that are required by law (e.g., IEP meetings).

Title I parents have multiple opportunities to impact policies, programming and the development of strategies to help their children. These opportunities are offered in both English and Spanish.

- *Technical Assistance the District Will Provide to Its Schools Related to the Students not Meeting AYP:*

These individuals are available to assist schools as requested in implementing the district plan:
Literacy coaches (1 each at two elementary schools)
Writing Coach (1 shared between all four buildings)
Reading Coaches (1 at 70% FTE and 1 at 14% FTE reading coaches at middle school)
Instructional strategies / Beginning teacher coach
Inclusion coach – 50% FTE
Technology Curriculum Specialist -
Curriculum Director
Paid Consultant – Raulene Morris – Language Arts / guided reading
Data support – collecting, filtering and feedback
Review and feedback on School Improvement Plans, Professional Development plans, and goals
Facilitation of curriculum development and material selection