

# **ADM High School**

Graduation Rate  
Credit Requirements  
Honors Diploma

## **GRADUATION RATE Areas of Focus**

- Quality process for the identification of At-Risk students and potential drop-outs.
- Continued support of the At-Risk Program and the efforts to deter students from dropping out
- Find a way to count alternative education students in our graduation rate

## Hierarchy of Interventions

Referral to the ALA for special education services.

### BAT Meetings

Building Assistance Team will discuss intensive interventions, parent involvement at a higher level than at Grade Level Teams. Principal and counselor involvement along with the students scheduled teachers. Grade Level Team data will be used to set a baseline for the intensive interventions. Alternative settings and graduation requirements will only be discussed if the students shows some success in previous levels.

### Grade Level Teams

Grade Level Teams reflect on teacher interventions, brainstorm comprehensive interventions and devise a plan or contract. A parent meeting with the Grade Level Team for students who consistently show up on the F/I list, which will clearly define the students difficulties, future expectations for success and the measures that will be used to monitor student success. Continued monitoring and reporting of student plan will be reported to the Grade Level Team and the parent/student. Students not meeting the expectations of the Grade Level Team will be referred to the Building Assistance Team.

### Positive Interventions

Classroom teacher implements positive interventions to meet student needs. Parent contact is made. Individual tutoring before or after school is assigned. The teacher brings concerns and attempted interventions to the Grade Level Team for collaboration.

### Differentiation

Teachers use differentiation strategies, authentic teaching, positive behavior supports, and formative assessments to gauge student understanding and adjust to the students needs. Clear measures are used to evaluate successful implementation of learning strategies.

### Advisory

All students are assigned to an Advisor. The Advisor is responsible to build a personal relationship with each student, check on each advisee's student progress, monitors each student for the number of times and in what subjects the student is on the F/I list for; this is reported to the Grade Level Teams. Advisors should contact teachers regarding their advisee's on the F/I list to get an understanding of what the student needs to do.

## Alternative Education Program

- The Alternative Education Program is intended for junior/senior level students and designed to help at-risk students meet their educational goals. This program allows for a flexible schedule and a reduced number of credits to meet graduation requirements. The Alternative Education Program is designed specifically for those students who have shown through many criteria to be at-risk and in need of programming that better fits their needs.
- Students enrolled in the Alternative program have a schedule that best fits their needs. This program is designed by the at-risk team base on the students needs.
- The Alternative program has specific criteria that students MUST meet to be enrolled. The criteria allows us to provide services to those students who truly need an alternative setting.



## Alternative Options

- Students who have been addressed through the hierarchy of interventions and still have not found success must have more intensive interventions that fit their individual needs.
- If students apply for and are granted permission to enroll in the Alternative program, the team has three options.
  - Option one: Continue to strive for a regular ADM Diploma (44 credits) with intensive interventions. For example: shortened day, Plato courses, schedule changes to earn just the credits needed to graduate, etc. These students count as a graduate for ADM High School.
  - Option two: Earn the ADM Level Two diploma (34 credits). This reduces the number of credits needed to graduate by not requiring elective courses. The student stays in the building and takes most courses with our teachers. These students count as a graduate for ADM High School.
  - Option Three: DMACC Adult High School Diploma ( 32 credits). All courses are taken at DMACC campus. These students DO NOT count as a graduate for ADM High School.

## Credit Recovery Criteria

- ADM High School firmly believes in giving students every opportunity to be successful. We work hard to create programs that are based on student needs. The PLATO program is for students who need a SPECIAL intervention based on academic difficulties, not performance, and life circumstances.
- Eligibility Guidelines
  - Students must make application to the At-Risk Committee for acceptance into the PLATO/Alternative Diploma program.
  - Students MUST be a Junior or Senior to be considered. Sophomores will not be enrolled in this program unless there are extraordinary circumstances.
  - Students working towards a regular ADM diploma cannot take more than two PLATO courses.
  - Students who fail a core class must repeat that course in our regular classroom before being considered for the PLATO course.
  - Students working towards an ADM Alternative Diploma cannot take more than four PLATO courses.
  - Early graduates cannot use PLATO courses in their total number of classes required for graduation.
  - Students MUST be self-motivated. Evidence of this will be reviewed by the committee. Students who have any of the following will NOT be considered for the PLATO/Alternative program:
    - Attendance- Excessive absences
    - Continued tardies to class
    - Incomplete work in class
    - Not attending tutoring outside of required times
    - Sleeping in class
    - Non-participation in class
    - Blatant Disrespectful behavior
- Recommendations to applicants
  - Come to school everyday, on time
  - Turn in all your assignments
  - Seek help outside of the school day
  - Make every effort in class to pass
  - Actively participate in class
- This program is not for students who do not meet the above criteria. Students who do not try in school or do not put in the extra effort to be successful are not students who will be successful in this program.



## Historical Evidence

- Since 2007 we have had a total of 15 students enrolled in the DMACC Adult High School Diploma program.
- Of those 15 students, 10 earned their adult diploma.
- 2 students were dropped due to lack of attendance.
- 1 student enrolled now is focused on getting her GED through DMACC.
- 4 of the students who earned an adult diploma counted against last years graduation rate.

## Graduation Rate Trajectory

- Iowa's State Board of Education has identified a graduation rate of 95 percent as the end goal by the year 2013-2014.
- ADM's Graduation Rate in 2009
  - 88.8%
- State Trajectory
 

– 2008-2009	91.3%
– 2009-2010	91.3%
– 2010-2011	92.2%
– 2011-2012	93.1%
– 2012-2013	94.1%
– 2013-2014	95%



## Conference Schools

- ADM: 88.80
  - No Alternative School: DMACC placement, PLATO Credit Recovery
  - Approximately 4-7 per year in some alternative program
  - DMACC does not count towards graduation rate
- Ballard: 96.55
  - Success Center (PLATO)
  - Varies; students are put into the PLATO courses beginning in 9<sup>th</sup> grade
  - Counts towards graduation
- Carlisle: 92.25
  - Woodward Academy/Des Moines Success Center
  - Approximately 10 per year
  - Counts toward graduation rate
- Winterset: 92.04
  - Alternative School
  - Approximately 10 per year
  - Counts towards graduation rate
- DCG: 93.98
  - Metro West Alternative School and APEX On-Line Learning
  - Approximately 9 per year
  - Counts towards graduation rate
- Boone: 87.60
- Carroll: 89.92
  - Alternative School
  - Approximately 24 per year
  - Counts towards graduation rate
- Saydel: 93.85
  - Metro West and Woodward and success program
  - Not specified
  - Counts towards graduation rate

## Increasing Graduation Requirements

- Currently we require 44 credits to graduate
- We require 6 credits per semester + P.E. to be considered full time
- This builds in 4 failures for students at 6 credits per semester. Students can fail more classes if they take more than 6 per semester
- Our schedule currently offers opportunities for 57 credits (this includes 4 years of P.E.)

## Historical Graduation Data

Year	>= 55 credits	>= 50 credits	>= 45 credits	44 credits	Grad on IEP/Alt diploma
Class 2009 106 Grads	17	57	5	5	6
Class 2008 108 Grads	14	55	25	10	4
Class 2007 105 Grads	14	45	27	9	10

Class of 2009 = 79 out of 106 graduated with more than 44 credits

Class of 2008 = 94 out of 108 graduated with more than 44 credits

Class of 2007 = 86 out of 105 graduated with more than 44 credits

## Benefits

- Increased emphasis on passing courses
- Increase students taking elective courses
- Expose students to more academic areas to prepare them for college and the work force
- Reduce wasted time in study hall time



## Creating an Honors Diploma

- Creating a diploma that rewards students for going above and beyond the minimum requirements
- Differentiating between the various levels of student achievement. We currently offer a regular diploma and an Level II diploma but we do not identify those students who are high achievers
- Suggested criteria for the ADM Honors Diploma:
  - 52 credits
  - Required to take the following courses:
    - Physics
    - British Literature and American Literature
    - 4<sup>th</sup> year of Math
    - 2 years of a foreign language
  - Grade Point Average of a 3.5

## Conference School Comparison

School	Schedule	# of Credits to Graduate	# of Credits from P.E.	Offer an Honors Diploma	# of Credits to earn an Honors Diploma
ADM	8 Period	44	1	No	
Boone	8 Period	48	4	No	
Ballard	8 Period	44	1	Yes	50
DCG	8 Period	48	2	Yes	54
Carroll	8 Period	52	8	No	
Carlisle	8 Period	47	8*	No	Looking at one
Perry	Trimester	66	3	Yes	Specific courses
Saydel	8 Period	48	2	No	
Winterset	Block	52	4	No	

\* Freshman/Sophomore must take P.E.—Junior/Senior can exempt if they are in sports, scheduling issues. But they all must have 47 credits to graduate.

## Recommendations

1. Looking at our current graduation rate and the resources in which we have to provide alternative education, I would recommend that we allow credits earned at DMACC Adult Diploma program to be accepted back as credits for ADM. This would ONLY apply to students who have been identified and accepted into our Alternative program. These students would earn an ADM Level Two diploma (34 credits), be included in our graduation ceremony, and counted towards our graduation rate.
2. Increasing graduation requirements would benefit our students through the overall experiences they encounter at ADM High School. Reducing acceptable failures will result in students utilizing the many resources we have to help students find success. This increase in graduation credits would apply to the graduating class of 2014.
3. Offering an ADM Honors Diploma will highlight and reward those students who strive to do above and beyond the minimum requirements. This diploma option could take affect beginning next year.





# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009 : Go	Form: 4 Display : Go Exit
District: 0027 Name: Adel DeSoto Minburn Comm School District	
School: Adel DeSoto Minburn Comm School District 0000 : Go	

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized Grades 3-5 District Math Totals</b>				
All Students	314 / 314 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(251+1)/289=87.2	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	67 / 67 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(43+0)/58=74.14	Met AYP Goal
Spec Ed. (IEP)	43 / 43 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(19+1)/37=54.05	Missed AYP
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	2 / 2 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(2+0)/2=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	5 / 5 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(4+0)/5=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	306 / 306 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(244+1)/281=87.19	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized Grades 3-5 District Reading Totals</b>				
All Students	315 / 315 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(247+5)/290=86.9	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	67 / 67 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(38+3)/58=70.69	Met AYP - Growth Safe Harbor



Hispanic	4 / 4 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+1)/4=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	310 / 310 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(243+7)/298=83.89	Met AYP Goal

### Summarized Grade 11 District Math Totals


All Students	108 / 108 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(84+0)/100=84	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	21 / 21 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(11+0)/16=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	7 / 7 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/6=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
ELL	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/0=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	4 / 4 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(2+0)/4=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	103 / 103 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(82+0)/96=85.42	Met AYP Goal

### Summarized Grade 11 District Reading Totals

All Students	108 / 108 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(83+0)/100=83	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	21 / 21 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(10+0)/16=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	7 / 7 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/6=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
ELL	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/0=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	4 / 4 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+0)/4=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	103 / 103 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(80+0)/96=83.33	Met AYP Goal

### Other Academic Indicator



 K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
95.8	Met	92.4	Met	Met

## Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0000 Adel DeSoto Minburn Comm School District

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

Display

(No District Activity)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: Paul Cahill, Phone: (515)281-3944Email: Tom Deeter, Phone: (515)242-5616Email: Mary Linnenbrink, Phone: (515)725-2107



# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009	Go	Form: 4 Display	Go	Exit
		District: 0027 School: 0172 Name: ADM Senior High School Grade(s): 10 through 12		
		School: ADM Senior High School 0172 Go		

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized School Math Totals</b>				
All Students	108 / 108 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(84+0)/100=84	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	21 / 21 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(11+0)/16=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	7 / 7 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/6=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
ELL	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/0=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	4 / 4 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(2+0)/4=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	103 / 103 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(82+0)/96=85.42	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized School Reading Totals</b>				
All		Met AYP		



All Students	108 / 108 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(83+0)/100=83	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	21 / 21 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(10+0)/16=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	7 / 7 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/6=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
ELL	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/0=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	4 / 4 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+0)/4=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	103 / 103 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(80+0)/96=83.33	Met AYP Goal

Other Academic Indicator				
K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
NA	Not Met	92.4	Met	Met

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0172 ADM Senior High School

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

[Display](#)

(No District Activity)

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\)](#)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: [Paul Cahill](#), Phone: (515)281-3944Email: [Tom Deeter](#), Phone: (515)242-5616Email: [Mary Linnenbrink](#), Phone: (515)725-2107





# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009 : Go	Form: 4 Display : Go Exit
District: 0027 School: 0209 Name: ADM 8-9 Middle School Grade(s): 08 through 09	
School: ADM 8-9 Middle School 0209 : Go	

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized School Math Totals</b>				
Students	92 / 96 = 95.83	Met AYP Goal	(79+0)/89=88.76	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	19 / 20 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(13+0)/17=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	11 / 15 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+0)/9=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	89 / 93 = 95.7	Met AYP Goal	(76+0)/86=88.37	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized School Reading Totals</b>				
A 11		Met AYP Goal		



All Students	92 / 96 = 95.83	Met AYP Goal	(78+3)/89=91.01	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	19 / 20 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(11+2)/17=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	11 / 15 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+2)/9=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+1)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	89 / 93 = 95.7	Met AYP Goal	(76+2)/86=90.7	Met AYP Goal

Other Academic Indicator				
K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
95.2	Met	NA	Not Met	Met

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0209 ADM 8-9 Middle School

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

Display

(No District Activity)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: Paul Cahill, Phone: (515)281-3944Email: Tom Deeter, Phone: (515)242-5616Email: Mary Linnenbrink, Phone: (515)725-2107





# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009 : Go	Form: 4 Display : Go Exit
District: 0027 School: 0209 Name: ADM 8-9 Middle School Grade(s): 08 through 09	
School: ADM 8-9 Middle School 0209 : Go	

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized School Math Totals</b>				
Students	92 / 96 = 95.83	Met AYP Goal	(79+0)/89=88.76	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	19 / 20 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(13+0)/17=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	11 / 15 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+0)/9=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Site	89 / 93 = 95.7	Met AYP Goal	(76+0)/86=88.37	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized School Reading Totals</b>				
All		Met AYP		



All Students	92 / 96 = 95.83	Met AYP Goal	(78+3)/89=91.01	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	19 / 20 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(11+2)/17=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	11 / 15 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+2)/9=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+1)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	89 / 93 = 95.7	Met AYP Goal	(76+2)/86=90.7	Met AYP Goal

Other Academic Indicator				
K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
95.2	Met	NA	Not Met	Met

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0209 ADM 8-9 Middle School

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

Display

(No District Activity)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: Paul Cahill, Phone: (515)281-3944Email: Tom Deeter, Phone: (515)242-5616Email: Mary Linnenbrink, Phone: (515)725-2107





# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009 : Go	Form: 4 Display : Go Exit
District: 0027 School: 0412 Name: ADM 6-7 Middle School Grade(s): 06 through 07	
School: ADM 6-7 Middle School 0412 : Go	

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized School Math Totals</b>				
All Students	220 / 220 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(180+0)/212=84.91	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	40 / 40 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(23+0)/34=67.65	Met AYP Goal
Spec Ed. (IEP)	24 / 24 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(10+0)/20=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	3 / 3 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/3=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	216 / 216 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(179+0)/208=86.06	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized School Reading Totals</b>				
All Students	220 / 220 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(166+5)/212=80.66	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	40 / 40 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(17+3)/34=58.82	Met AYP - Triennium



Spec Ed. (IEP)	24 / 24 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(5+3)/20=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	3 / 3 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+1)/3=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	216 / 216 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(165+4)/208=81.25	Met AYP Goal

Other Academic Indicator				
K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
95.7	Met	NA	Not Met	Met

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0412 ADM 6-7 Middle School

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

[Display](#)

(No District Activity)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: Paul Cahill, Phone: (515)281-3944Email: Tom Deeter, Phone: (515)242-5616Email: Mary Linnenbrink, Phone: (515)725-2107





# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009 : Go	Form: 4 Display : Go Exit
District: 0027 School: 0418 Name: DeSoto Intermediate School Grade(s): 03 through 05	
School: DeSoto Intermediate School 0418 : Go	

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized School Math Totals</b>				
Students	258 / 260 = 99.23	Met AYP Goal	(212+1)/242=88.02	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	45 / 45 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(29+0)/40=72.5	Met AYP Goal
Spec Ed. (IEP)	29 / 31 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(10+1)/25=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	2 / 2 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(2+0)/2=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	4 / 4 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+0)/4=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	251 / 253 = 99.21	Met AYP Goal	(206+1)/235=88.09	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized School Reading Totals</b>				
All Students	259 / 260 = 99.62	Met AYP Goal	(210+4)/243=88.07	Met AYP Goal



Low SES	45 / 45 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(26+2)/40=70	Met AYP - Biennium
Spec Ed. (IEP)	30 / 31 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(15+3)/26=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	2 / 2 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/2=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	4 / 4 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(2+0)/4=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	252 / 253 = 99.6	Met AYP Goal	(207+4)/236=89.41	Met AYP Goal

Other Academic Indicator				
K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
95.8	Met	NA	Not Met	Met

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0418 DeSoto Intermediate School

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

Display

(No District Activity)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: Paul Cahill, Phone: (515)281-3944Email: Tom Deeter, Phone: (515)242-5616Email: Mary Linnenbrink, Phone: (515)725-2107





# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009 <input type="button" value="Go"/>	Form: 4 Display <input type="button" value="Go"/> <input type="button" value="Exit"/>
District: 0027 School: 0421 Name: Minburn Elementary School Grade(s): K through 05	
School: Minburn Elementary School 0421 <input type="button" value="Go"/>	

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized School Math Totals</b>				
All Students	54 / 54 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(37+0)/45=82.22	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	21 / 21 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(13+0)/17=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	12 / 12 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(7+0)/10=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	53 / 53 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(36+0)/44=81.82	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized School Reading Totals</b>				
All Students	54 / 54 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(36+1)/45=82.22	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	21 / 21 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(11+1)/17=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	12 / 12 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(4+0)/10=NA	Calculated Total tested <



(111)		test date < 40		30
Hispanic	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	53 / 53 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(35+1)/44=81.82	Met AYP Goal

## Other Academic Indicator

K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
96.2	Met	NA	Not Met	Met

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0421 Minburn Elementary School

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

Display

(No District Activity)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: Paul Cahill, Phone: (515)281-3944Email: Tom Deeter, Phone: (515)242-5616Email: Mary Linnenbrink, Phone: (515)725-2107





# Iowa Department of Education



School Year: 2008-2009 : Go	Form: 4 Display : Go Exit
District: 0027 School: 0409 Name: ADM Elementary School Grade(s): PK through 02	
School: ADM Elementary School 0409 : Go	

## AYP Adequate Yearly Progress

### 2008-2009 AYP Display

2008-2009 Participation Display			2008-2009 Assessment Display	
Subgroup	Number Tested / Enrolled = % Tested	Participation Status	# Prof + Additional Meeting Growth / FAY = % Prof + Growth	Assessment Status
<b>Summarized School Math Totals</b>				
Students	89 / 89 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(73+0)/83=87.95	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	11 / 11 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(8+0)/10=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	8 / 8 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+0)/7=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	2 / 2 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/2=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	85 / 85 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(70+0)/79=88.61	Met AYP Goal
<b>Summarized School Reading Totals</b>				
All		Met AYP		



All Students	89 / 89 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(68+0)/83=81.93	Met AYP Goal
Low SES	11 / 11 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(5+0)/10=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Spec Ed. (IEP)	8 / 8 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(3+0)/7=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
African American	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Asian	1 / 1 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(1+0)/1=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
Hispanic	2 / 2 =NA	Enrolled on test date < 40	(0+0)/2=NA	Calculated Total tested < 30
White	85 / 85 = 100	Met AYP Goal	(67+0)/79=84.81	Met AYP Goal

Other Academic Indicator				
K-8 Attendance Rate	K-8 Status	Graduation Rate	Graduation Status	Other Academic Indicator Status
96	Met	NA	Not Met	Met

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

0027-0409 ADM Elementary School

Form

Form Modified Date

Certified Date

Display

(No District Activity)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

For questions regarding this form, please contact one of the following staff:

Email: Paul Cahill, Phone: (515)281-3944Email: Tom Deeter, Phone: (515)242-5616Email: Mary Linnenbrink, Phone: (515)725-2107



## Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Need to Knows:

### 1. Adequate Yearly Progress Determinations:

- Assessments used for accountability are the ITBS (grades 3-8) and the ITED (grade 11) in reading and mathematics.
- ITBS/ITED reading is referred to as the "reading comprehension" subtest.
- ITBS Math is a combination of the "math concepts and estimation" and "math problem solving and data interpretation" subtest. ITED math is the "mathematics: concepts and problem solving subtest.
- Iowa is also required to combine the results for grades 3-8 and 11 for AYP decisions. School level AYP decisions are determined by combining all grades at a school site. District level AYP decisions are determined by combining grades 3-5 for elementary, grades 6-8 for middle school, and grade 11 for high school.

### Participation:

- First step in determining AYP for schools and districts is to examine participation rates. Schools and districts must document a minimum of 95 percent participation to make AYP.
- Up to three years of participation data will be used by the state to determine if a school meets the required participation rate.
- There is a minimum number of 40 as the threshold for AYP decisions for each subgroup.

### Proficiency:

- Next step in determining AYP for schools and districts is to examine proficiency rates.
- Proficiency rates combine all grades at a school site, or grades 3-5, 6-8 and 11 at a district level.
- The minimum number for inclusion of a group in AYP is 30.
- Only students enrolled for a full academic year (FAY) are included in the proficiency calculation.

### Steps used to determine proficiency:

1. A school and district proficiency index is calculated. "The proficiency index is a result of a statistical procedure used to combine the results of different grades to yield a single AYP decision."
2. If proficiency is not met using the index, Safe Harbor is examined. Safe Harbor requires a 10 percent or greater reduction in the percentage of non-proficient student from the previous year to the current year.



3. If Safe Harbor is not met, a biennium data check is performed. This is an average of last year and this year's data.
4. If AYP is still not met after a biennium data check, a triennium data check is performed for grades 4, 8, and 11.

Other Academic Indicators:

Final step in determining AYP

- K-8 average daily attendance rate – a school and district must meet the state average daily attendance rate.
- Graduation Rate – a school and district must meet the trajectory targets determined by the State Board of Education's goal of 95% by 2013-2014. Target for 2009-2010 is 91.3%.
- In order for a district to miss the OAI, the district must NOT meet both targets.





# Iowa Department of Education


 School Year: 2008-2009 

 Form: 96 Print Summary All  

Form Must Be Completed By: Both Public and Non-Public

District: 0027 School: 0000 Name: Adel DeSoto Minburn Comm School District

Division of PK-12 Education

## Annual Progress Report (APR)

### Minimum Requirements

Due Date: September 15

## Print Summary All, Public

### Chapter 12 Improvement Goals Reading

#### 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)

##### PUBLIC

The board, with input from its School Improvement Advisory Committee (SIAC), shall adopt annual improvement goals based on data from at least one districtwide assessment. The goals shall describe desired annual increase in the curriculum areas of, but not limited to, mathematics, reading, and science achievement for all students, for particular subgroups of students, or both. Annual improvement goals may be set for the early intervention programs as described in subrule 12.5(18), other state indicators, locally determined indicators, locally established student learning goals, other curriculum areas, future student employability, or factors influencing student achievement.

- Annual improvement goals must be measurable.
- Annual improvement goals must address improvement of student learning, not maintaining of current levels of achievement.

 Long-Range  
Goals from  
CSIP:  
281--IAC  
12.8(3)(b)(3)

All PK-12 students will achieve at high levels in reading comprehension, prepared for success beyond high school.

 2008-2009  
Current School  
Year Annual  
Goals:  
281--IAC  
12.8(3)(b)(4)

Increase the percent of secondary students achieving at the proficient range and above (41st percentile or higher) on the ITBS/ITED Reading Comprehension subtest. To measure this goal, we will "collapse" 2007-08 data for students in grades 5-10 and then compare it to "collapsed" data for students in grades 6-11 in 2008-09.

In 2007-08, 80.3 % of ADM 5-10th grade students were proficient or above on the ITBS/ITED reading comprehension subtest.

 Were the  
Annual Goals  
Met?

YES

 Supporting  
Data to  
demonstrate  
that the district  
has or has not

Our goal was to increase the percent of secondary students achieving at the proficient range and above (41st percentile or higher) on the ITBS/ITED Reading Comprehension subtest. We met this goal. In 2007-08, 80.3 % of ADM 5-10th grade students were proficient or above on the ITBS/ITED reading comprehension subtest. This year, 81.3% of 6th-11th grade students (cohort group) were proficient and above on the reading comprehension subtest.



met its goal:	
If the District Did Not Meet its Goal 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)  The plan to meet future goals includes the following:	(Not Required)
2009-2010 Next School Year Annual Goals: 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)	Increase the percent of students proficient and above on the ITBS/ITED reading comprehension subtest. To measure this goal we will compare the percent of students proficient and above in grades 3-11 in 2008-09 (baseline data 82.1%) to the percent of students proficient and above in 2010.



## Chapter 12 Improvement Goals Math

## 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)

## PUBLIC

The board, with input from its School Improvement Advisory Committee (SIAC), shall adopt annual improvement goals based on data from at least one districtwide assessment. The goals shall describe desired annual increase in the curriculum areas of, but not limited to, mathematics, reading, and science achievement for all students, for particular subgroups of students, or both. Annual improvement goals may be set for the early intervention programs as described in subrule 12.5(18), other state indicators, locally determined indicators, locally established student learning goals, other curriculum areas, future student employability, or factors influencing student achievement.

- Annual improvement goals must be measurable.
- Annual improvement goals must address improvement of student learning, not maintaining of current levels of achievement.

Long-Range Goals from CSIP: 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(3)	All PK-12 students will achieve at high levels in mathematics, prepared for success beyond high school.
2008-2009 Current School Year Annual Goals: 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)	Our mathematics goal for 2008-09 is to increase the percent of students achieving at the proficient range and above (above the 41st percentile) on the ITBS math problem-solving and data interpretation subtest. To measure this goal, we will collapse 2007-08 data for students in grades 3-7 and then compare it to collapsed data for students in grades 4-8 in 2008-09. In 2007-08, 83.5% of ADM 3rd-7th grade students were above the 41st percentile on the ITBS math problem-solving and data interpretation math subtest (baseline data).
Were the Annual Goals Met?	YES
Supporting Data to demonstrate that the district has or has not met its goal:	Our goal was to increase the percent of students achieving at the proficient range and above (above the 41st percentile) on the ITBS math problem-solving and data interpretation subtest. In 2007-08, 83.5% of ADM 3rd-7th grade students were above the 41st percentile on the ITBS math problem-solving and data interpretation math subtest (baseline data). This year, our 4th-8th graders (cohort group) scored 84.3% at the proficient range and above.
If the District Did Not Meet its Goal 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)  The plan to meet future goals includes the following:	(Not Required)
2009-2010 Next School Year Annual Goals: 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)	Our mathematics goal for 2009-10 is to increase the percent of students proficient and above on the ITBS/ITED Math Total subtest. To measure this goal, we will compare the percent of students proficient and above in grades 3-11 in 2008-09 (baseline data is 84.9%) to the percent of 3-11 students proficient and above in 2010.



## Chapter 12 Improvement Goals Science

**281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)****PUBLIC**

The board, with input from its School Improvement Advisory Committee (SIAC), shall adopt annual improvement goals based on data from at least one districtwide assessment. The goals shall describe desired annual increase in the curriculum areas of, but not limited to, mathematics, reading, and science achievement for all students, for particular subgroups of students, or both. Annual improvement goals may be set for the early intervention programs as described in subrule 12.5(18), other state indicators, locally determined indicators, locally established student learning goals, other curriculum areas, future student employability, or factors influencing student achievement.

- Annual improvement goals must be measurable.
- Annual improvement goals must address improvement of student learning, not maintaining of current levels of achievement.

✓ Grade 8 is served.

✓ Grade 11 is served.

Neither Grade 8 or Grade 11 is served.

**SCIENCE ONLY:** At this time, whole grade sharing districts that do not serve students in grade 8 or grade 11 (or both) because they send these students to another district are not required to have science goals or report science goal progress for the grade level or levels served by another district. The rest of this form IS required, and will appear below, if EITHER GRADE 8 AND/OR GRADE 11 IS SERVED. See selection at left for latest status according to IDoE data.

Long-Range Goals from CSIP: 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(3)	All PK-12 students will achieve at high levels in science, prepared for success beyond high school.
2008-2009 Current School Year Annual Goals: 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)	For 2008-09, ADM's science goal is to increase the percent of high school students in the proficient range and above (41st percentile and above) on the ITED science subtest. To measure this goal, we will collapse 2007-08 data for students in grades 8-10 and then compare it to collapsed data for students in grades 9-11 in 2008-09. In 2007-08, 87.9% of ADM 8-10th grade students were proficient and above on the ITBS/ITED subtest (baseline data)
Were the Annual Goals Met?	NO
Supporting Data to demonstrate that the district has or has not met its goal:	Our goal was to increase the percent of high school students in the proficient range and above (41st percentile and above) on the ITED science subtest. We did not meet this goal. In 2007-08, 87.9% of ADM 8-10th grade students were proficient and above on the ITBS/ITED subtest (baseline data). This year, 85.9% of our 9-11th graders (cohort group) were proficient and above. This was less than was expected and is the 2nd consecutive year we have seen a decrease in the percent of high school students proficient in science.
If the District Did Not Meet its Goal 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)  The plan to meet future goals includes the following:	As a district, all staff will be working on identifying essential learnings in the content areas and developing an understanding of the Iowa Core Curriculum during professional development time next year. 3rd-11th grade science teachers will be involved in their second year of Heartland AEA Science CAB training, focusing on best practices in science instruction, and including on-site coaching of teachers. In the spring of 2009, the science teachers participated in an in-depth item analysis of ITBS/ITED data. They will use their findings to make changes in curriculum, instruction and assessment in the upcoming year.
2009-2010 Next School	Increase the percent of students proficient or above on the ITBS/ITED Science subtest. To measure this goal, we will compare the percent of students proficient and above in grades 3-11 in 2008-09 to



<div>●</div> <div>Year Annual Goals: 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(4)</div>	the percent proficient and above in 2009-10.
---	--



## Chapter 12 Multiple Assessments

## Assessment Selections 281--IAC 12.8(3)(b)(5)

## PUBLIC

- All districts must report reading and mathematics multiple assessment data, the multiple assessment must include one reading assessment at any grade level and one math assessment at any grade level served by a district.
- Districts are only required to report science multiple assessment data if they serve students in grades 8 and/or 11. The assessment can be at any grade level served by the district.
- Whole grade sharing districts only report data within grade levels served by the district.

[View Complete Assessments List](#)
[List of All Available Assessments](#)

## Reading

<b>Assessment Used:</b>	Benchmarks (a.k.a. Benchmark Books; Benchmark Reading; Curriculum Benchmark Tasks) (27)
<b>Other Assessment:</b> Name/description/comment about the "other" assessment, or N/A if whole grade sharing.	(No "Other" Assessment Data)
<b>Explanation -- How did the students do on this test?</b>	<p>Students in grades Kindergarten through 5th grade participate in benchmark reading assessments. End of the year benchmarking is reported here. The number reflects the percentage of students at the grade level whose benchmark score was at grade level or above.</p> <p>Kindergarten: 92% First Grade: 88% Second Grade: 83% Third Grade: 85% Fourth Grade: 90% Fifth Grade: 88%</p>

## Math

<b>Assessment Used:</b>	District Developmental Assessments (84)
<b>Other Assessment:</b> Name/description/comment about the "other" assessment, or N/A if whole grade sharing.	(No "Other" Assessment Data)
<b>Explanation -- How did the students do on this test?</b>	<p>A district created benchmark assessment given in 8th grade measures students mastery of key concepts and skills cumulative to this point. The numbers reported reflect the percentage of students at "mastery" on this assessment. Mastery is defined as a score of 80% (or higher) correct on the assessment.</p> <p>8th Grade Mathematics Assessment</p> <p>Basic (0-69% correct): 1.0% of students Proficient (70-79% correct): 11.5% of students Mastery (80-100% correct): 87.5% of students</p>



**Science**

<b>Assessment Used:</b>	District Developmental Assessments (84)
<b>Other Assessment:</b> Name/description/comment about the "other" assessment, or N/A if whole grade sharing.	(No "Other" Assessment Data)
<b>Explanation -- How did the students do on this test?</b>	<p>A district created benchmark assessment given in 8th grade measures students mastery of key concepts and skills in science. The numbers reported reflect the percentage of students at "mastery" on this assessment. Mastery is defined as a score of 80% (or higher) correct on the assessment.</p> <p>8th Grade Science Assessment</p> <p>Basic (0-69% correct): 5.3% of students Proficient (70-79% correct): 18.6% of students Mastery (80-100% correct): 76.1% of students</p>



## Chapter 12 Post-Secondary Data

### Measure of Probable Post-Secondary Success 281--IAC 12.8(3)(a)(6)

Percentage of high school students (any students in grades 9-12 who took ACT during the school year) achieving a score or status on a measure indicating probable post-secondary success.

<b>List assessment used and cut score:</b>	Adel DeSoto Minburn uses the ACT as a measure of probable post-secondary success. The cut score for that assessment is a score of 20.
<b>This measure is the measure used by the majority of students in the school, school district, or attendance center who plan to attend a post-secondary institution.</b>	<p><b>99</b> Total number of students achieving a score or status on a measure indicating probable post-secondary success. If the measure used is the ACT, the cut score for probable post-secondary success is 20. (Number of students who took the ACT test with probable post-secondary success: <b>99</b>. Iowa Testing information from Project EASIER BEDS table.)</p> <p><b>114</b> Total number of students who took the test. (Number of students who took the ACT test: <b>114</b>. Iowa Testing information from Project EASIER BEDS table.)</p> <p><b>86.84%</b> Total percentage of students achieving a score or status on a measure indicating probable post-secondary success. The percentage is the number of students who took the ACT and scored 20 or higher, divided by the number of students who took the ACT.</p>
<b>If available, ACT data will be automatically provided. These data are from the last available Spring B.E.D.S.</b>	

### Post-Secondary Education/Training Intentions 281--IAC 12.8(3)(a)(5)

<b>All high school seniors who intend to pursue post-secondary education or training.</b>	<p><b>100</b> Total number of seniors who intend to pursue post-secondary education/training. (Number of seniors who declared post-secondary education intentions: <b>100</b>. Data from Project EASIER BEDS table.)</p> <p><b>112</b> Total number of seniors who have graduated. (Number of seniors: <b>112</b>. Data from Project EASIER BEDS table.)</p>
<b>PUBLIC</b> These data are from the last available Spring B.E.D.S.	<p><b>89.29%</b> Total percentage of seniors intending to pursue post-secondary education/training. The percentage is the number of seniors who intend to pursue post-secondary education/training, divided by the number of seniors.</p>

### Core Program Completers 281--IAC 12.8(3)(a)(7)

<b>All high school graduates who completed a core program which includes four years of English/language arts and three or more years each of mathematics,</b>	<p><b>64</b> Total number of high school graduates who completed a core program.</p> <p><b>112</b> Total number of high school graduates.</p> <p><b>57.14%</b> Total percentage of high school graduates who completed a core program. Percent arrived at by dividing the number of graduates who completed a core program by the total number of graduates.</p>
---	--



## Chapter 12 Post-Secondary Dropout Data

### Dropout Data 281--IAC 12.8(3)(a)(4)

"Dropout" means a school-age student who is served by a public school district, or accredited nonpublic school, and enrolled in any of grades seven through twelve and who does not attend school or withdraws from school for a reason other than death or transfer to another approved school or school district or has been expelled with no option to return.

**IMPORTANT** Dropout data lags by one school year for the purpose of the APR summary to be viewed by the general public. On this form, the dropout data are from the prior school year (2007-2008), while the APR itself is in the current school year (2008-2009).

#### Dropout Definitions

Students who satisfy one or more of the following conditions are considered dropouts:

1. Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled by October 1 of the current school year or
2. Was not enrolled by October 1 of the previous school year although was expected to be enrolled sometime during the previous school year (i.e., not reported as a dropout the year before) and
3. Has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district-approved educational program; and
4. Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
  - a. transfer to another public school district, private school, or state or district-approved educational program,
  - b. temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness,
  - c. or death.
5. A student who is in a program designed to earn a GED is considered a dropout.

**All Dropouts  
2007-2008**

**6** Total number of All Dropouts, grades 7-12.

**707** Total number of All Students, grades 7-12.

**0.85%** Total percentage of All Dropouts, grades 7-12.

Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.

#### DROPOUT SUBGROUPS

**Female  
2007-2008**

**2** Total number of Female Dropouts, grades 7-12.

**342** Total number of Female Students, grades 7-12.

**0.58%** Total percentage of Female Dropouts, grades 7-12.

Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.

**Male  
2007-2008**

**4** Total number of Male Dropouts, grades 7-12.

**365** Total number of Male Students, grades 7-12.

**1.10%** Total percentage of Male Dropouts, grades 7-12.

Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.

**White (not of  
Hispanic  
origin)  
2007-2008**

**6** Total number of White (not of Hispanic origin) Dropouts, grades 7-12.

**685** Total number of White (not of Hispanic origin) Students, grades 7-12.

**0.88%** Total percentage of White (not of Hispanic origin) Dropouts, grades 7-12.

Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.

**Black (not of**

**0** Total number of Black (not of Hispanic origin) Dropouts, grades 7-12.



<b>Hispanic origin) 2007-2008</b>	<div> <div>2</div> <div>Total number of Black (not of Hispanic origin) Students, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>0.00%</div> <div>Total percentage of Black (not of Hispanic origin) Dropouts, grades 7-12. Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.</div> </div>
<b>Hispanic 2007-2008</b>	<div> <div>0</div> <div>Total number of Hispanic Dropouts, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>15</div> <div>Total number of Hispanic Students, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>0.00%</div> <div>Total percentage of Hispanic Dropouts, grades 7-12. Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.</div> </div>
<b>American Indian or Alaskan Native 2007-2008</b>	<div> <div>0</div> <div>Total number of American Indian or Alaskan Native Dropouts, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>1</div> <div>Total number of American Indian or Alaskan Native Students, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>0.00%</div> <div>Total percentage of American Indian or Alaskan Native Dropouts, grades 7-12. Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.</div> </div>
<b>Asian or Pacific Islander 2007-2008</b>	<div> <div>0</div> <div>Total number of Asian or Pacific Islander Dropouts, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>4</div> <div>Total number of Asian or Pacific Islander Students, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>0.00%</div> <div>Total percentage of Asian or Pacific Islander Dropouts, grades 7-12. Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.</div> </div>
<b>Disabled/IEP 2007-2008</b>	<div> <div>1</div> <div>Total number of Disabled/IEP Dropouts, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>82</div> <div>Total number of Disabled/IEP Students, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>1.22%</div> <div>Total percentage of Disabled/IEP Dropouts, grades 7-12. Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.</div> </div>
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) 2007-2008</b>	<div> <div>0</div> <div>Total number of English Language Learners (ELL) Dropouts, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>2</div> <div>Total number of English Language Learners (ELL) Students, grades 7-12.</div> </div> <div> <div>0.00%</div> <div>Total percentage of English Language Learners (ELL) Dropouts, grades 7-12. Percent arrived at by dividing the number of Dropouts by the total number of Students.</div> </div>



### Additional State Requirements

#### Other Locally Determined Indicators 281--IAC 12.8(3)

These are additional indicators that impact student learning as determined by the local school or school district. N/A does not apply—every school district must report at least one additional locally determined indicator.	Student Attendance (average daily attendance rates for 2008-09)	
	Elementary	96.60%
	Middle School	96.58%
	K-8 Average	96.60%
	District Average	95.63%

#### Progress with Early Intervention Goals 281--IAC 12.8(3)(a)(8)

Early intervention goal(s) might be the same as a 4th grade reading or mathematics goals or can be reading and mathematics goals specific to K-3.

Early intervention goal(s) might also be class size reduction goals.

Did the school districts accept Early Intervention funding?

YES

All school districts receiving Early Intervention block grant funds shall report progress with their early intervention goals.

2008-09 Early Intervention Goal  
The number of 4th grade students proficient and above in reading comprehension as measured by the ITBS will increase from the percent in 2007-08.

We have met our goal. ITBS data for the 2008-09 school year show 92.2 % of all ADM 4th grade students scored at the proficient level or higher on the reading comprehension subtest. In 2007-08, 80.6% of all ADM 4th grade students were at the 41st percentile or above.



**Athletic Eligibility Report for the Iowa State Board of Education****Assistance for Student Athletes**

Check any of the following assistance mechanisms that your district provides for student athletes in grades 9-12.

- ☒ Classroom teacher interventions
- ☒ Coach interventions
- ☐ Study hall/study table
- ☒ Tutors
- ☒ Parent involvement
- ☒ Classroom interventions
- ☒ Problem solving team
- ☒ Before/after school help
- ☒ Counseling services
- ☒ At-risk program
- ☒ Progress reports

**Other**

Describe any other student athletic eligibility standards or assistance mechanisms for your school district.

Failing and Incomplete lists (weekly)  
Homeroom required tutoring



Assurances	
<b>Assurances -- Public ONLY</b>	
YES	The district has adopted the three achievement levels used by the Iowa Testing Programs, and the alternate achievement standards for the Iowa Alternate Assessment.
YES	The district has provided individual student achievement reports and grade level performance descriptors from the Iowa Tests to parents.
YES	The district has incorporated Core Content <b>Reading</b> Standards and Benchmarks corresponding to the Iowa Tests into their standards sets.
YES	The district has incorporated Core Content <b>Math</b> Standards and Benchmarks corresponding to the Iowa Tests into their standards sets.
YES	The district has incorporated Core Content <b>Science</b> Standards and Benchmarks corresponding to the Iowa Tests into their standards sets.
YES	The district has students that are English Language Learners (ELL).
YES	The district has adopted English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for ELL students.
<b>Assurances -- Public and Non-Public</b>	
YES	All information required for this APR has been or will be reported to the local community. Here is the date(s) the required content was or will be reported to the community: <b>October 15, 2009</b>

District Information	
Authorized Agency	Adel DeSoto Minburn Comm School District 801 Nile Kinnick Dr S Adel, Iowa 50003 AEA: AEA 11 Heartland (district filed under aea control code 9211)
Primary APR Contact	Name: * Greg Dufoe Title: * Superintendent Telephone: * 515 - 993 - 4283 Extension: FAX: * 515 - 993 - 4866 Email: * Click, below, to email contact: <a href="mailto:gdufoe@adel.k12.ia.us">gdufoe@adel.k12.ia.us</a>



# Adel DeSoto Minburn



## Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2009-2013

Prepared September 2009



Question #1:

What do data tell us about our student learning needs?

The following narrative answers to the four Constant Conversation Questions provide a general description of the school improvement processes being used in the Adel DeSoto Minburn Community School District. It tells the story of where the district is now in this process and their vision for future efforts. The actual working documents being used by teachers, administrators, and other stakeholder groups in undertaking these efforts contain more detailed information than is shared in this overview document. These detailed documents are available at the office of the Director of School Improvement.

*The Data We Collect*

Adel DeSoto Minburn CSD collects the following required data: **(LRDA1)**

- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED reading and mathematics at grades 4,8 and 11
- Trend line and subgroup data for ITBS/ITED science for grades 8 and 11
- Student achievement data from assessments other than the ITBS and ITED:
  - Data from district developed reading benchmark assessments grades PK-5
  - Data from district developed mathematics benchmark assessments grades PK-8
  - Data from district developed science benchmark assessments grades 6-10
  - End of course assessments from Iowa Testing Program for Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II
- Graduation rate
- Grade 7-12 dropout percentages (aggregate and subgroup)
- Percentage of students planning to pursue postsecondary education
- Percentage of graduates completing the core curriculum (4 years of English, 3 years each of mathematics, science and social studies)
- Career and technical education student data
- Percentage of high school students achieving a score or status on a measure indicating probable postsecondary success. Adel DeSoto Minburn uses the American College Test (ACT)
- Trend line data from the Iowa Youth Survey at grades 6, 8 and 11 (**SDF1, SDF3, SDF4**)
- A community-wide needs assessment which includes input from community members, parents, administrators, staff and students (completed once every five years) (**LC3**)
- Participation rates for required district-wide assessments
- Aggregate and subgroup attendance data

Additionally, we collect and analyze the following data in an effort to provide a more complete picture of the student learning needs at ADM:

- ITBS/ITED data for other grade levels and subject areas (3,5,6, 7, 9 and 10)
- ITBS/ITED cohort data for grades 4-11 for reading, mathematics and science
- Phonemic Awareness, Concepts about Print, and Letter/Sound Identification assessments for grades PK and K
- Letter/Sound Identification and Dictation Task assessments for grade 1



- Phonics Inventory and Sight Words assessments for grades 1 and 2
- Gates McGinitie reading test for grades 1 & 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Title I students
- COGATS for grades 3, 5 and 8
- Success rate of our Reading Recovery program
- Title I participation and dismissal rates
- Special education participation rates
- Student discipline data, including office referrals, suspensions, expulsions, and bus write-ups (**SDF1, SDF3**)
- Parent-Teacher conference attendance
- Recommendations from the Department of Education site visit report (2008)
- Referrals to building assistance teams (BATs)
- Instructional strategies implementation data
- District demographic data
- Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) data

### *Data Analysis*

#### *Our Process*

The district believes in a distributive leadership model that structures opportunities for various stakeholder groups to give input into many parts of the school improvement process. The ADM administrative team has worked to identify these needed stakeholder groups and to structure time and opportunities for them to meet. These groups include the district advisory committee, an instructional leadership committee, building advisory committees, curriculum committees, and grade level teams. The appropriate committees analyzed various data, which led to the drafting of our student achievement goals. Draft goals were then presented to the Adel DeSoto Minburn Board of Education for adoption.

#### *Our Findings*

The Adel DeSoto Minburn Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics and Science curriculum committees, along with our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), administrative team, district advisory committee and board of education analyzed data from the ACT, ITBS and ITED, along with some data from our district benchmark assessments. Since our student population is small, we initially (5 years ago) established biennium trend lines for our ITBS/ITED data. Along with grade level trend data, we look at cohort data at grades 4-11 to give us a different view of achievement of our students and the impact of our curriculum. This cohort data also proved to be valuable in setting our annual achievement goals for reading, mathematics and science. (**LRDA1, LRDA2, LRDA3, LRDA4**)

The committees used a common process for looking at the data. The graphs of data they used for trend line analysis, subgroup analysis and cohort analysis were produced by Heartland AEA's HEART (Heartland Educational Assessment Resource Toolbox) database. Committees generated the following findings in the Spring of 2009:



#### College Readiness (ACT data)

- The 2009 composite of 23.1 was higher than the state average at 22.4. This is the highest composite score since 1990. The composite in 2006 was 23.1 as well.
- The subtest area with the highest average score in 2009 was reading with an average score of 23.7. This is the second highest score in this subtest in the past 7 years. The state average is 22.9.
- The English subtest average score was 22.4, an increase for the first time in two years. The state average was 21.9.
- The science subtest score was 22.6. The state average score was 22.4.
- 73% of our 2009 graduating class took the ACT, which is tied for the highest participation rate with 2003.
- The percent of ACT-tested students ready for college-level coursework as identified by their scores on the ACT subject area tests are:
  - College English Composition: 89%
  - College Algebra: 61%
  - College Biology: 46%
  - College Social Science: 72%
  - Students Meeting all 4: 39%

#### ITED/ITBS data

In reviewing our reading comprehension secondary ITBS/ITED data for the past 5 years:

- The percent of all students proficient or advanced in grades 6-12 is in the low to mid 80s.
- Non-IEP students at all grade levels 6-12 score in the high 80s to low 90s percent proficient or advanced.
- In 2009 the 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade class showed significant improvement from 2008 with increases of 5.9% and 12.3% respectively.
- Generally, the percent proficient remains fairly steady throughout a cohort's testing history.
- Our 6-8 IEP subgroup met AYP for the first time in two years due to the safe harbor provision.

In reviewing our secondary math and science ITBS/ITED data for the past 5 years, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Overall, ADM has a higher percentage of students proficient in the areas in math and science than in reading (typically mid 80s- mid 90s% proficient).
- Non-IEP students outperform IEP students in math and science by a wide margin.
- In grade 11 math the percent proficient and above has ranged from a high of 91.6% in 2005 to a low of 82.7% in 2008.
- In grade 10 math the percent proficient and above has ranged from a high of 86.2% in 2007 to a low of 80.0% in 2005.
- In grade 9 math there was a decrease in the percent of students proficient in 2009 (84.7%) from the previous three years percentages of over 90% proficient and above.
- The grade 6-8 cohorts in math show steady proficiency levels.
- In grades 6-12 the highest percent proficient in science in 2009 was in 6<sup>th</sup> grade (94.3%) and the lowest was in 10<sup>th</sup> grade (81.3%)
- In grades 6,8,9 and 11, there has been an increase in the percent of students proficient in science over the past 5 years
- In grade 10, a downward trend of students proficient has begun in the past 2 years.
- The 6-8 IEP subgroup met AYP for the first time in two years in 2009.



Our elementary ITBS data shows the following in reading comprehension:

- In 2009 4<sup>th</sup> grade had the highest percent of students proficient and above – 92.2%. Third grade had 79.8% proficient and above and 5<sup>th</sup> grade had 82.2% proficient and above.
- Non-IEP students outscore IEP students by a wide margin. Non-IEP students' scores range from 86.5% to 96.7% proficient and above in grades 3-5 in 2009 while IEP students scored in the 30-50% range.
- The 5<sup>th</sup> grade class of 2009 has shown improvement two years in a row, moving from 76.2% proficient and above as 3<sup>rd</sup> graders in 2007 to 82.2% in 2009 as 5<sup>th</sup> graders.

Our elementary ITBS data shows the following in math and science:

- Our percent of students proficient in both math and science in grades 3-5 is generally in the mid to upper 80s.
- Non-IEP students outperform IEP students in math and science.
- There has been a decline in the number of 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students proficient on the Math Problem-Solving and Data Interpretation subtest in the past few years

#### *District Benchmark data*

In the past five years, our reading benchmark data shows

- The percent of kindergarten students reading on or above grade level has ranged from 88% to 96%
- The percent of first grade students reading on or above grade level has ranged from 81% to 88%
- The percent of second grade students reading on or above grade level has ranged from 83% to 89%
- The percent of third grade students reading on or above grade level has ranged from 76.5% to 91%
- The percent of fourth grade students reading on or above grade level has ranged from 78% to 91%
- The percent of fifth grade students reading on or above grade level has ranged from 81% to 91%

#### *Other Indicator data (attendance/graduation)*

- We have had two consecutive years of small kindergarten classes at our Minburn building, necessitating the development of a K-1 multi-age classroom for that building. In 2009-2010 that multi-age classroom has moved to a 1-2 combination.
- According to our 2008-2009 APR data, district attendance has improved from 94.87% in 2007-2008 to 95.63% in 2008-2009.
- In the past five years, ADM's graduation rate has fluctuated from a high of 97.52% in 2005 to a low of 89.60% in 2004. According to our 2008-2009 AYP, our graduation rate was 92.4%.
- Preschool through 9<sup>th</sup> grade, we have over 90% of our parents attend fall parent/teacher conferences
- During the 2008-09 school year, Title I Reading served 59 students in grades K-3 (in 2002-03, 69 ADM students were served). Of these, 19 (32%) were dismissed, due to reading on grade level or above. The 2002-03 dismissal rate was 42%
- During the 2008-09 school year, the success rate for our Reading Recovery program was 48%. The success rate in 2002-03 was 71.4%
- Longitudinal data: 77% of all Reading Recovery students who were served in first grade and are now in fifth grade, have maintained on-grade level reading as indicated by our district assessments (This includes all students on an IEP for reading). Two of the three students who



are currently below grade level as indicated by our district assessments are receiving special education services in the area of reading.

- Longitudinal data: 54% of all Reading Recovery students who were served in first grade and are now in fifth grade, have maintained on-grade level reading as indicated by ITBS (This includes all students on an IEP for reading). Of the six students below grade level 2 of those students are receiving Special Education in the area of reading.

Our *guidance committee* has been tracking student data from the Iowa Youth Survey given in 2005. They have worked with an AEA assessment consultant to analyze the data. The Iowa Youth Survey included responses from ADM 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> graders. The committee's analyses found the following: (SDF2, SDF4)

- In the past six years, there has been a decrease in the percent of students reporting participation in violent/aggressive behaviors (22.2% in 1999 to 17.4% in 2005)
- In the past three years, there has been an increase in the percent of students reporting that they have used alcohol, tobacco and/or drugs
- In the past six years, there has been an increase in the percent of students show perceive school to be safe (82.5% in 1999 to 85.1% in 2005)
- In the past six years, there has been little change in the percent of students who feel social pressure to use controlled substances (20% in 1999 to 19.7% in 2005)
- In the past six years, there has been an increase in students reporting that they feel supported by staff (from 32.8% in 1999 to 37.9% in 2005)
- In the past six years, there has been an increase in the percent of students who feel it is wrong to smoke, drink, use drugs or engage in fights (72.2% in 1999 to 75.7% in 2005)

Our guidance committee will analyze the results of the 2008-2009 Iowa Youth Survey during the 2009-2010 school year.

In February 2008, the Department of Education conducted a site visit to Adel DeSoto Minburn. The team findings from this visit included several suggested areas of improvement. These included:

- More professional development on incorporating technology in curriculum
- Review student transitions (between buildings, starting school, exiting school)
- Maintain strong elementary literacy program
- Continue expanding literacy focus at secondary level
- Explore more data sources in setting school improvement paths (ACT data, graduate surveys, subgroup data, etc.)

A *community-wide needs assessment* was conducted the spring of 2003 by the ADM High School marketing class. Results of this survey indicated these top issues facing the Adel DeSoto Minburn school district:

- Improve basic reading and math achievement
- Student behavior
- Drug use by students

The district intends to do a needs assessment survey in the 2009-2010 school year.

Our technology committee, along with representatives from Heartland AEA, conducted a technology audit in 2002 using the EnGAUGE model from NCREL. Their findings included:



- Improving involvement of stakeholders in creation/revisions to the technology plan
- Improving technology support at buildings to increase technology use and integration into curricular areas
- Increase time allotted to technology professional development for instructional planning

#### *Our Conclusions*

Based on the data reviewed, the district developed the following list of prioritized student needs in 2009: **(LC4)**

- Increase the percent of students proficient or above on the ITBS/ITED reading comprehension subtest.
- Increase the percent of students proficient or above on the ITBS/ITED math total subtest.
- Increase the percent of students proficient or above on the ITBS/ITED science subtest.
- Increase the percent of IEP students proficient or above on the ITBS/ITED reading comprehension, math, and science tests.
- Increase the graduation rate.
- Increase technology professional development opportunities to improve technology integration in curricular areas PK-12
- Increase participation in 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade advisory programs, building positive relationships.



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

*Long-Range Goals*

Based on recommendations of the curriculum committees and the Adel DeSoto Minburn District Advisory Committee, the school board has adopted district goals aligned with student needs. (LC5)

*Student Learning Goals*

Adel DeSoto Minburn's Student Learning Goals are the general expectations for all its graduates. Students graduating from Adel DeSoto Minburn Community School District will be able to do the following: (LC6)

Adel DeSoto Minburn students will

- Acquire the knowledge base needed to use effectively strategies and skills necessary for success in adult life
- Be effective communicators
- Be complex thinkers
- Be collaborative workers
- Be self-directed learners
- Be responsible citizens

*Student Achievement Goals*

Adel DeSoto Minburn's long-range Student Achievement Goals describe the district's targets over an extended period of time. These long-range goals provide a focus for the district's actions and decisions, meet locally determined student needs and address state and federal student accountability. Each year, more specific, measurable goals will be set in an effort to reach the long-range goals.

Student Achievement Goal #1: All PK-12 students will achieve at high levels in reading comprehension, prepared for success beyond high school. (LRG1, MCGF3, AR6, EIG1, FTP1)

*The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 1:*

- Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (41<sup>st</sup> percentile or above using national norms) on the ITBS Reading Comprehension Test in grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Reading Comprehension Test in grades 9 through 11, including data disaggregated by subgroup
- Percentage of students in grades PK through 5 who are reading at or above grade level as measured by district reading benchmark assessments



Student Achievement Goal #2: All PK-12 students will achieve at high levels in mathematics, prepared for success beyond high school. **(LRG2, MCGF3, AR6, FTP1)**

*The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 2:*

- Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (41<sup>st</sup> percentile or above using national norms) on the ITBS Mathematics Total Test in grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Mathematics Test in grades 9 through 11, including data disaggregated by subgroup
- Percentage of students grades PK through 8 who score at the mastery level (80% correct and above) on district developed mathematics benchmark assessments

Student Achievement Goal#3: All PK-12 students will achieve at high levels in science, prepared for success beyond high school. **(LRG3, MCGF3, AR6, FTP1)**

*The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 3:*

- Percentage of students who score at the proficient level or above (41<sup>st</sup> percentile or above using national norms) on the ITBS Science Test in grades 3 through 8 and the ITED Science Test in grades 9 through 11, including data disaggregated by subgroup
- Percentage of students in grades 6-10 who score at the mastery level (80% correct and above) on district developed science benchmark assessments

Student Achievement Goal#4: All ADM students will feel safe at and connected to school.

*The following indicators will measure district progress with Goal 4:*

- Attendance rate as measured by the average daily attendance data
- Graduation rate as calculated by the Iowa Department of Education
- Percentage of middle and high school students that receives office referrals **(SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)**
- Percentage of students in grades 6, 8 and 11 that indicate they have used alcohol, tobacco, or other drugs as reported by the Iowa Youth Survey **(SDF5, SDF6, SDF7)**

### *Actions to Meet the Goals*

#### *Overview of the Process*

As was stated in Question #1, the district believes in a distributive leadership model. This model structures opportunities for various stakeholder groups to give input into not only the goals, but also the actions to meet those goals. The administrative team has worked to identify these needed stakeholder groups and to structure time and opportunities for them to meet and be a part of the process. These groups include the district advisory committee, an instructional leadership committee, building advisory committees, curriculum committees, and grade level teams.



*District curriculum committees* (2008) focused their input on Goals #1-3.

*Mathematics* committee members came to these conclusions regarding actions needed to improve student achievement in their area:

- Align our curriculum with assessments
- Help math teachers connect reading comprehension strategies to their discipline. Need to teach vocabulary and bridge reading work to math work
- Look into student motivation issues at the secondary level

*Science* committee (2008) members came to these conclusions regarding actions needed to improve student achievement in their area:

- Increase use of technology in science
- Revisit the sequencing of our science courses...does it best meet student needs?
- Analysis of graphs and charts a needed skill in science...an area of weakness on tests
- Better integrate math and science skills (transfer issues)
- Need focused science professional development

*The Reading and Language Arts committees* (2008) identified the following areas of improvement:

- A clearer curriculum document for grades 6-12 for reading and language arts
- A framework for teaching in grades 6-12 (like the balanced literacy model in grades PK-5)
- Training on research-based practices in teaching writing
- Incorporating the 6+1 Trait writing model and language into district curriculum documents
- Creating a district writing assessment
- Continued training on research-based reading strategies at the 6-12 level

In addition, the district's *Technology Committee* used data, feedback from professional development sessions and recommendations from the other curriculum committees along with an analysis of the current state of district technology and technology integration and are developing their action plan for supporting Goals #1-3. The technology action plan will include plans for professional development on technology integration for all PK-12 staff and administration along with identifying professional development needs for ADM technology teachers. (**FTP3, FTP4, FTP5**) All committee action plans are on file in the district. This process of analyzing data and current status then developing an action plan will occur annually.

*ADM's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT)* focuses their input on Goals #1-3. They conduct analyses of the current district professional development practices, professional development best practices (Iowa Professional Development Model) and gaps that needed to be addressed. In addition, the ILT analyzes



- Teacher feedback on the training days in August to provide suggestions for modifications to the professional development plans for the current school year
- Student achievement data and teacher feedback to help determine the content and design the plan for professional development for the following school year

As with other district committees, data from these analyses is used to create action plans for district professional development along with building level implementation of the district professional development. In 2009-2010 the district ILT will be studying Professional Learning Communities and the major concepts that guide PLCs. There are four major questions that guide a professional learning community:

1. What do we want students to learn?
2. How will we know if they learned it?
3. What will we do if they do not learn it?
4. What will we do if they already know it?

This study of the PLC model focuses directly on curriculum, instruction and assessment and will be the vehicle through which we will address school improvement.

*The District Advisory Committee* annually reviews district data and action plans. Their input included:

- Increasing the percent of IEP students proficient and above in reading comprehension, math, and science.

#### *Actions to meet district goals and student needs*

The majority of ADM's actions to meet district goals are a part of the District's Professional Development Plan.

Adel DeSoto Minburn's District Professional Development Plan is a multi-tiered plan designed to meet the diverse learning needs of our staff while focusing our efforts on our district goals. (**PERK1, SPED1, TQ7, IEI1, LEP1**) As a district, our professional development efforts will be in the area of reading instruction, specifically text comprehension strategies. Reading comprehension strategies has been an ongoing focus for PK-5 teachers and has been a focus for secondary staff for the past five years. The district believes that by focusing on text comprehension strategies, student achievement in all areas will increase. (**AMN1, AMN2, AMN3**)

Our professional development focus is based on analysis of student data and of teachers' needs, as outlined in question #1 and in the section above. (**TQ2**)



Adel DeSoto Minburn's five-year District Professional Development Plan will be addressing Long-Range Goals 1-3. **(PD6, TQ1)** Following is an overview of our five-year Professional Development Plan. A more detailed five-year plan, along with specific annual goals, activities, and program evaluation are on file at the central office.

The content of the district professional development is chosen based on a review of research-based strategies. The district reading strategist, the superintendent, principals, and ILT members, conducts this review. This group looks at the Iowa Content Network website, professional journals and other resources to find strategies that meet the federal definition of scientifically based research. **(PD5)**

Based on our data analyses, the district will continue to focus on literacy in our professional development plan. The specific professional development content will be different for PK-2, 3-5 and 6-12 teachers, based on where they are in their professional learning cycle. The PK-5 teachers will focus their efforts on integrating reading comprehension strategies beyond the literacy block, helping students use comprehension strategies flexibly and in combination, along with effective vocabulary instruction, which is an area of literacy that has not received targeted professional development in the past. The 6-12 teachers will continue to focus their efforts this year on comprehension strategy instruction, integrating it into their curriculum, differentiating strategies to meet all learners' needs and connecting with essential learnings and assessments in their curriculum. **(TQ4)** We are using the Gradual Release model as our model for explicit instruction on the seven comprehension strategies identified by Pearson. **(TQ3)**

All teachers, PK-12, will also be working on integrating technology into implementation of strategies, with the support of our technology staff. **(FTP2, FTP4, LEP1)** All teachers will also begin addressing the Iowa Core Curriculum as a part of their professional development, and the district will begin to develop their implementation plan during the 2008-09 school year.

AEA consultants, along with district staff, serve as the professional development providers for ADM. The district approves these providers. **(TQ6)**

The content of the staff development not only aligns with ADM's Long-Range Goals, but it also aligns with the Iowa Teaching Standards. Specifically, ADM's professional development addresses the following teaching standards and criteria **(TQ5)**:

- Standard #2 Demonstrates competence in content knowledge (criteria 2b, 2c, and 2d)
- Standard #3 Demonstrates competence in planning (criteria 3a, 3d, and 3e)
- Standard #4 Uses strategies to deliver instruction that meet the multiple learning needs of students (criteria 4a, 4d, 4e, and 4f)
- Standard #5 Uses a variety of methods to monitor student learning (criteria 5a)
- Standard #7 Engages in professional growth (criteria 7a, 7b, 7c, and 7d)

The design of the professional development learning opportunities for all PK-12 staff will include the following components **(TQ7)**:



- Initial training days in August with full days for training spread throughout the school year (theory presentations, modeling of strategies, discussions and planning for implementation)
- Monthly building staff meetings (reviewing implementation data, further planning for implementation, further study of strategies, technology integration ideas)
- Regular grade level meetings at the elementary buildings and middle school for collaboration on implementation of strategies and data analysis
- Classroom demonstrations of strategies with follow-up reflection
- Monthly meetings of the building Instructional Leadership Team (analyzing data quarterly and making recommendations on the design and content of the professional development)
- Quarterly meetings of the district Instructional Leadership Team to evaluate district professional development efforts

All teachers responsible for instruction (including Title I, Special Education, At-Risk, ELL and GATE teachers) will be involved in professional development focused on instructional strategies to support our long-range goals in reading, mathematics and science. (TQ8) Not all staff will be a part of the same training opportunities. Our professional development plan differentiates learning experiences to best meet the teachers' needs and the needs of their students. Outside of text comprehension strategy training, the following strands will be operating

- PK-12 instrumental and vocal music teachers have been trained in the Comprehensive Musicianship Project. The focus of this national project is to look at music as text and provide strategies for music teachers to help students learn the whole text of music, not just the performance aspect. This curriculum committee continues to meet and refine their curriculum based on this project. Activities include rewrite standards and benchmarks, creating consistent curriculum maps, integrating technology, and designing effective assessments that align with this new curriculum.
- PK-12 physical education teachers will be continuing their work to define a physical education program with a focus on fitness. This includes aligning assessments to practice, working on goal-setting with students (a professional development focus area for teachers) and designing ways to communicate student achievement in physical education with the community (in the same way we communicate other achievement data)(TQ4)
- The high school at-risk teacher will be continuing to define the curriculum. Activities include mapping the curriculum, in-service on the PLATO learning system, designing communication strategies with stakeholders (teachers, parents, community) and designing program evaluation. (TQ4, AR7)
- PK-12 guidance counselors will monitor and continue to map character education program activities as part of meeting Long-Range Goal #4. (SDF9)
- PK-12 GATE (gifted and talented education) teachers completed, in 2007-08, a self-audit of our GATE program. The teachers are choosing areas for improvement from that audit as the focus of their professional development. This includes creating a consistent PEP for the district, working with general education



teachers on differentiation strategies to meet gifted students' needs, and identifying their own professional development needs.

*Sustaining district professional development efforts*

To sustain the professional development efforts, accountability for teacher implementation has been developed and will be monitored by building administrators and the superintendent through teacher implementation data and the use of walk-throughs. Further, district-designed optional professional development opportunities, such as study teams, are offered to staff. These opportunities will allow staff ways to dig deeper into the theory and research underlying our professional development focus and provide more extensive feedback on implementation efforts. Additionally, district professional development opportunities are submitted for re-licensure and graduate credit through Heartland AEA and Drake University.

*Sustaining district professional development at the building level*

Each building in the Adel DeSoto Minburn school district has developed a building professional development plan for sustaining the District Professional Development Plan. These plans include time set aside for staff during the workday, specific activities for the staff to sustain the learning, desired outcomes, and ways to measure success. Beyond the building action plans, grade level teams have created action plans with quarterly SMART goals and action steps they will take to ensure that annual goals will be met. Further, each teacher has developed an Individual Professional Development Plan that identifies specific professional development needed in order for teachers to effectively help the building and district meet student achievement goals. These plans are on file at each building or at the central office.

*Sustaining district professional development with committee work*

All committees in the district develop an action plan for their work that focuses those activities on the district's goals. These action plans are available at the central office.

*Data-Driven Decision Making*

The Adel DeSoto Minburn school district supports a data-driven decision making model for all school improvement efforts. As a part of the district calendar, professional development time is set aside annually for the review of data and the creation of action plans. This data review and action step development will happen with district level committees and building level teams. In all cases, annual goals are set that support the district's long-range goals and action plans are developed along with ways to monitor the progress of the plans and achievement of the goals. District and building level administrators set time aside throughout the school year for collaborative monitoring of these goals and plans.



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

*Overview*

Adel DeSoto Minburn (ADM) will use multiple data sources to determine if student learning has changed over time in relation to our long-range goals. These multiple data sources include district-wide standardized assessments, district-developed benchmark assessments (grade-level or course specific), classroom assessments and surveys. The superintendent, along with the building administrators, will ensure that the data is collected, analyzed and shared with the various teacher and community leadership groups, including the Instructional Leadership Team, the curriculum committees, the District Advisory Committee, the Building Advisory Committees and grade level committees. These groups will use the data to determine if student learning has changed in relation to the district's long-range goals and in relation to the annual goals each committee has set to support the long-range goals. The district will continue to ensure that all students enrolled at the specified grade level are included in district-wide assessments. **(DWAP1)**

*Monitoring Progress*

ADM will monitor progress on its long-range goals through analysis of aggregate and disaggregated trend line data from the following data sources:

- ITBS reading comprehension, math total and science tests at grades 3-8 (Goals #1-#3)
- ITED reading comprehension, math total and science tests at grades 9-11 (Goals #1-#3)
- District benchmark reading assessments at grades PK-5 (Goal #1) **(DWAP3, DWAP4, DWAP6)**
- District benchmark math assessments at grades PK-8 (Goal #2) **(DWAP7)**
- District benchmark science assessments at grades 6-10 (Goal #3) **(DWAP8)**
- Attendance data from the district's student information management system (Goal #4)
- Office referral/discipline data from building office records (Goal #4)
- Student reported usage of alcohol, tobacco or other drugs as reported through the Iowa Youth Survey (Goal #4)
- Graduation rate (Goal #4)

*Alignment of Assessments and District Standards*

To assure that the assessments used to monitor progress on ADM's student achievement goals are aligned with the curriculum, ADM completed the Iowa Technical Adequacy Project (ITAP) process for the ITBS, ITED and district benchmark assessments. Through this process, the district found it was necessary to review and revise our reading, mathematics and science standards and benchmarks. This review and revision process will now be a regular activity for every curricular area committee.



### *Student Data Used for Evaluating Programs and Services*

The same student 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 Adel DeSoto Minburn:

- Professional development for teachers, associates and administrators (e.g., District Professional Development Plan, Building Professional Development Plans, Individual Professional Development Plans 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 prevention programs (Title IV, Part A)
- Character education programs
- Early intervention programs for grades PK-3
- PK-12 at-risk program
- PK-12 gifted and talented (GATE) program
- Special education services
- Career and Technical Education programs
- Reading Recovery
- Mentoring and Induction program

Specific information regarding Adel DeSoto Minburn's program/service evaluation processes is included in Question 4.

### *Additional Data*

To help provide a more complete picture of student learning needs, ADM 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 assessments
- Cohort performance from grade 4 through grade 11 as measured by ITBS, ITED and district benchmark assessments in the areas of reading, mathematics, science and social studies
- Career and technical education student data from the end-of-the-year program report (Perkins)
- ELDA Proficiency Test for English Language Learners and/or Language Assessment Scale (LAS) to measure ELL students' English proficiency (**LEP2**)
- Percentage of students who participate in extra-curricular activities at the middle school and high school
- Students reported on weekly incomplete/failing lists at middle school and high school
- Success rate of our Reading Recovery program
- Students staffed in/staffed out of special education program
- Gates-McGinitie reading test
- Dismissal rate in our Title I reading program
- Percent of students who met ADM's definition of "technologically literate"



*ADM's Data Plan 2009-2013*

The district is aware that more work needs to be done in the area of formative and summative assessments to drive classroom decision-making. The following actions are a part of an on-going data review plan for ADM:

- Continue to revise district benchmark assessments to make them more reliable, valid and rigorous
- Investigate other standardized assessments as ways to collect data on student achievement
- Create a protocol for administering district assessments to make them more standardized
- Continue to investigate the use of electronic data management systems to more efficiently store, retrieve, and analyze district data
- Focus deeply on formative assessment strategies. Current research clearly demonstrates that formative assessments that allow the teacher and the student to adjust learning tactics throughout the teaching sequence positively impact student achievement.



Question #4:

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

*Overview*

Adel DeSoto Minburn (ADM) will be using a goal-oriented approach to formally evaluate our programs and services designed to meet student needs and support our CSIP goals. (ECSIP1) As suggested by the Iowa Department of Education, ADM's goal-oriented approach to program evaluation will include the following components:

- Identification of CSIP goals and other program goals
- Identification of variable that affect performance
- Identification of the indicators by which performance will be judged
- Development of procedures for collecting information regarding performance
- Collection of performance data
- Comparison of the information regarding performance with the expectations
- Communication of the results of the comparing to the appropriate audiences

To formally evaluate our programs, ADM will use both formative and summative data from various data sources. (TQ12)

*Program Evaluation Timetable*

The Adel DeSoto Minburn administrative team, along with other stakeholder groups, is still in the process of developing a manageable timetable for our formal program evaluations. Formative evaluation data for all of our identified programs is and has been collected annually (and in some cases, more frequently); however, a systematic process for using that formative data and summative data in order to evaluate the programs' effectiveness is still being refined.

At this time, ADM plans to conduct an in-depth formal summative evaluation for all the programs identified in the CSIP within a five-year rotation. The frequency of the formative and summative evaluation processes for these programs will be determined by both legal mandates and local data.

Below is a (still in revision) timetable for ADM's summative program evaluation.

- District Professional Development Plan (including Title II, Part A)
  - Annually
- Title I, Part A (Parental Involvement)
  - Annually
- Mentoring and Induction Program
  - Every two years, beginning the 2004-05 school year
- Career and Technical Education Programs (Perkins)
  - Every five years, beginning the 2004-05 school year
- Drug Prevention Programs (Title IV: Safe and Drug Free Schools)
  - Every three years, beginning the 2005-06 school year



- Special Education programs and services
  - Every three years, beginning the 2005-06 school year
- Early Intervention programs for grades PK-3
  - Every three years, beginning the 2005-06 school year
- Reading Recovery
  - Every three years, beginning the 2005-06 school year
- At-Risk program (including the Learning Center)
  - Every three years, beginning the 2006-07 school year
- Use of Technology to Improve Student Achievement (Title II, Part D: E2T2)
  - Every three years, beginning the 2006-07 school year
- Programs and services to assist English Language Learners (Title III, Part A)
  - Every five years, beginning the 2007-08 school year
- Gifted and Talented (GATE) program
  - Every five years, beginning the 2007-08 school year
- Character Education Programs
  - Every five years, beginning the 2008-09 school year

Results of these program evaluations will be shared with the administrative team, the district advisory committee, the school board and with other appropriate stakeholder groups.

#### *Student Data to be used in the Program Evaluation Process*

Because the Adel DeSoto Minburn school district believes that the goal of all of its programs, services and efforts is to increase student achievement, the same student data used to measure progress with our CSIP goals will also be used to help inform decisions regarding the effectiveness of the following:

- Professional Development Plan (**TQ11**)
- At-Risk program (**AR4**)
- Career and Technical Education programs (Perkins) (**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**)
- Technology to Improve Student Achievement (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**)
- Character Education Programs
- Gifted and Talented Programs (**GT2**)



*Additional Data to be used in the Program Evaluation Process*

In addition to student achievement data, ADM will need other types of student data and also teacher data to determine the effectiveness of some of our programs. The district will collect, analyze and use the following data to inform effectiveness of certain programs:

- Professional Development Plan and Title II, Part A (**TQ10, TQ11, TQ12, TPTR1**)
  - Percentage of staff responsible for instruction who participate in district and building professional development opportunities
  - Increase of knowledge and skill of staff due to professional development opportunities
  - Frequency and quality of implementation of strategies from professional development opportunities
  - Percentage of PK-12 teachers documenting technology usage in lesson plans
  - Percentage of PK-5 students reading at or above grade level as measured by district reading benchmark assessments
  - Percentage of 6-12 students performing at the mastery level on classroom assessments throughout the course or year
- Mentoring and Induction Program (**TQ9**)
  - Percentage of teachers in mentoring and induction program recommended for a third year of mentoring
  - Percentage of teachers in mentoring and induction program recommended for licensure
  - Teacher retention rate compared to Heartland AEA data as measured through Heartland new teacher survey
- Gifted and Talented Program (**GT2**)
  - Percentage of the identified student population in the GATE program
  - Percentage of the GATE students who meet goals in their individualized learning plans
  - Student perceptual data on the program (done through surveys)
- Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs) (**PERK2, PERK3**)
  - Percentage of students by subgroup (specifically gender) who enroll in career and technical programs
  - Percentage of graduates by subgroup who were program concentrators and received a high school diploma or equivalent
  - Percentage of program completers by subgroup who indicate their intention to continue their education, non-military employment or military employment
  - Percentage of senior program completers who are proficient in occupational skills.



- **Special Education Programs and Services (ESPE1)**
  - Percentage of students with individualized education programs (IEP) who meet their IEP goals
  - Percentage of students meeting their IEP goals as compared to regional data provided by AEA
  - Percentage of students staffed in and staffed out of Special Education
  - Percentage of special education teachers who meet the highly qualified guidelines
  - Percentage of special education teachers who meet the goals of the district professional development plan.
  - Percentage of goals met by the district on the Part B and Part C indicator data
- **Title I, Part A, Parental Involvement (TITL1)**
  - Percentage of parents who participate in the annual evaluation of the parental involvement policy
- **Title III (LEP3)**
  - Percentage of identified ELL students who are proficient in English as determined by the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT)
- **Reading Recovery**
  - Percentage of students classified as successful
  - Percentage of students who increase their reading level, as measured by the district-developed reading benchmark assessment
- **Character Education**
  - Student perceptual data as measured by a survey to be developed
  - Percentage of students with office referrals disaggregated for kinds of referrals and number of referrals per student
  - Percentage of students with bus discipline referrals
  - Percentage of students reporting use of alcohol, tobacco or other drugs as reported through the Iowa Youth Survey
- **At Risk programs (AR4)**
  - Percentage of students who participate in extra-curricular activities at the middle school and high school
  - Percentage of students at middle school and high school reported on weekly incomplete/failing lists
  - Percentage of students involved in support groups
  - Percentage of low SES students who achieve below the 41<sup>st</sup> percentile on ITBS and ITED tests