COLORADO
Department of Education

LOVELAND CLASSICAL SCHOOL UIP 2016-17   District: **THOMPSON R2-J** | Org ID: **1560** | School ID: **5235** | Framework: **Pending** | **Draft UIP**

Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for School (2016-2017)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

How are students performing? Where will the school focus attention?

Priority Performance Challenges: Specific statements about the school's performance challenges (not budgeting, staffing curriculum, instruction, etc.), with at least one priority identified for each performance indicator (Achievement, Growth Gaps, PWR), where the School did not meet federal, state and/or local expectations.

Name: Elementary Math (Computation and Application)
Description: Elementary Math (Computation and Application combined) for grades 1-5 had a 4.4% decrease in the Benchmark testing results between the Spring sessions of 2015 and 2016. In recent PARCC/CMAS assessments the student performance in Elementary (3-5) Math has declined between Spring 2015 and Spring 2016 from 28% to 22% (Met or Exceeded).

Name: Middle School Math (Computation and Application)
Description: Middle School Math (Computation and Application combined) for grades 6-8 had a 6.4% decrease in the Benchmark testing results between the Spring sessions of 2015 and 2016. In recent PARCC/CMAS assessments the student performance in Middle School Math (6-8) has declined between Spring 2015 and Spring 2016 from 24% to 22% (Met or Exceeded).

Name: Middle School Literacy (Fluency and Comprehension)
Description: Middle School Literacy (Fluency and Comprehension combined) for grades 6 - 8 had a 8.0% decrease in the Benchmark testing results between the Spring sessions of 2015 and 2016. In recent PARCC/CMAS assessments the student performance in Middle School Literacy (designated English Language Arts) has declined between Spring 2015 and Spring 2016 from 27% to 25% (Met or Exceeded).

Why is the education system continuing to have these challenges?

Root Causes: Statements describing the deepest underlying cause, or causes, or performance challenges, that, if dissolved, would result in elimination, or substantial reduction of the performance challenge(s).

Name: Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework
Description: LCS' classical curriculum incorporates the Core Knowledge and Singapore Math curricula. More work towards aligning LCS' curriculum and the revised state standards, and teacher implementation, is a major strategy. Further, LCS' students do not have previous exposure to the PARCC computer-based framework and question types before testing.

Name: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program
Description: LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and an improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing.

Name: Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework
Description: LCS' classical curriculum incorporates the Core Knowledge and Singapore Math curricula. More work towards aligning LCS' curriculum and the revised state standards, and teacher implementation, is a major strategy. Further, LCS' students do not have previous exposure to the PARCC computer-based framework and question types before testing.

Name: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program
Description: LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and an improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing.

Name: Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework
Description: LCS' classical curriculum incorporates the Core Knowledge and Singapore Math curricula. More work towards aligning LCS' curriculum and the revised state standards, and teacher implementation, is a major strategy. Further, LCS' students do not have previous exposure to the PARCC computer-based framework and question types before testing.

Name: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program
Description: LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and an improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing.

Major Improvement Strategies

Major Improvement Strategies: Identify the major improvement strategy(s) that will address the root causes determined in the data narrative.

Name: Continued Expansion of Targeted Intervention Support
Description: In 2014/15, intervention support was implemented in elementary literacy and middle school math, and elementary literacy experienced a 4.0% annual increase and middle school math experienced a 5.1% annual increase. In 2015/16, elementary literacy experienced a 4.8% increase year-year. With additional FTE available, both literacy and math intervention strategies will be spread to the rest of the K-12 program based on the 2014/15 strategy implemented.

Name: Further Student Exposure to Revised State and PARCC Expectations
Description: A major area of focus to target growth in literacy and math is to coordinate teacher accountability on instructing towards the grade level standards on LCS' Scope and Sequence with lesson and unit preparation. Much work was completed by LCS' teachers in developing and mapping a comparison of LCS' standards (tied to LCS' Core Knowledge, Singapore Math and Classical curricula) to the state's standards. The next step is consistent application of LCS' standards toward classroom instruction, as seen as teacher communication of LCS Standards (which are to meet and exceed the state's) covered in lesson plans turned in on a weekly basis.

Access the School Performance Framework here:http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance

Improvement Plan Information

Additional Information about the school

Comprehensive Review and Selected Grant History

Related Grant Awards

Has the school received a grant that supports school improvement efforts? When was the grant awarded?

Colorado Start-up Implementation Grant, 2011/12 - 2013/14

School Support Team or Expedited Review

Has (or will) the school participated in an SST or Expedited Review? If so, when?

No

External Evaluator

Has the school partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used.

Yes, CSSI visit associated with Start-up Implementation Grant, 2013/14

Improvement Plan Information

The school/district is submitting this improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (check all that apply):

- ✓ State Accreditation
- ☐ Title I Focus School
- ☐ Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)
- ☐ Colorado Graduation Pathways Program (CGP)
- ☐ School Improvement Support Grant
- ☐ Other

School Contact Information

Ian Stout
Principal
3835 14th St. SW.
Loveland CO. 80537
Phone: (970) 541-1507 ext. 101
Email: istout@lovelandclassical.org

Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification

Description of school Setting and Process for Data Analysis

Provide a brief description of the school to set the context for readers. Include the general process for developing the UIP and participants (e.g., SAC involvement). The description may include demographics and local context, such as location, performance status, notable recent events or changes, stakeholders involved in writing the UIP, and an overview of the general process.

Narrative:
I. School Setting and Process for Data Analysis
HISTORY MISSION VISION and DEMOGRAPHICS
Loveland Classical Schools is a K-12 classical charter school entering its fifth year. Its focus on classical education is defined by three main areas; classical culture, classical curriculum, and classical pedagogy. Classical culture is defined by the schools' emphasis on virtue, and is implemented in the schools' core virtues K-12 program, behavioral support processes, and school curriculum. Classical curriculum is defined and implemented by the use of original sources from the Western canon which have lasted the course of time and were the backbone of education for two millennia. Classical pedagogy is defined and implemented by the use of the trivium, being instructional practices within the grammar, logic, and rhetoric levels of knowledge acquisition.

History: In the spring of 2010 two mothers of preschoolers met while volunteering in their sons' preschool. Both women had been researching schools to determine the right fit for their children. It became explicitly clear that a classical education best met their needs and goals. Thus began the chartering process that lead to LCS opening its doors to approximately 500 students as a K-9 school in the fall of 2011. In the first five years of existence, LCS has grown to a full K-12 school serving approximately 760 students as of Fall 2016. In this time LCS' classical culture, curriculum, and pedagogy had been solidified. From 2011-2014, LCS averaged 10.2% year-year growth on the CDE's school performance framework, and maintains the "Performance" status on the CDE's School Performance Framework.

LCS' mission is to assist parents in developing young minds with virtuous character, critical thinking skills, and a passion for learning to become exceptional community stewards.
LCS' vision is to partner with parents to champion the following values:
The pursuit of excellence through vigorous diligence. The joy of success is found in hard work through academically challenging material.
The habituation of ethical virtues. Moral character is inculcated through our twelve core virtues.
The cultivation of social responsibility. Stewardship and service are encouraged as we work to better our community.

LCS' 2016/17 demographics are as follows:

Asian 1%

American Indian 0%

Black 0.3%

Hispanic 13%

White 84%

Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander 0.3%

Multiple Races 2%

ELL Students 4%

ESS (IEP) Students 6%

FRL Students 30%

The 2016/17 UIP was written in coordination with returning teachers from the English and math departments, and reviewed with the SAC. LCS has three weeks of staff in-service before the beginning of school, and during this time the 2015/16 internal benchmark performance data was reviewed to analyze student performance and growth, and to identify root causes of success and opportunities, along with strategies for improvement. This initial report was presented to the LCS Board of Directors on 7/21/2016. Once 2015/16 state PARCC and CMASS data was received, those were analysed and incorporated into the UIP. Further discussion within the departments and with administration formed the school target setting form and the action plan.

Prior Year Targets

Consider the previous year's progress toward the school targets. Identify the overall magnitude of the school performance challenges.

Performance Indicator: Academic Achievement (Status)

Prior Year Target: *Reading Target*
1.5% year-year increase between 2014/15 and 2015/16 on School-Wide Spring Reading (Fluency & Comprehension) Benchmark testing.

2014/15, 81.5% of students scored average and above on School-Wide Spring Reading Benchmark testing.
2015/16 Spring Benchmark Target: 83% of students scoring average or above on School-Wide Spring Reading Benchmark testing.
Performance:

Prior Year Target: *Math Target*
1.5% year-year increase between 2014/15 and 2015/16 on School-Wide Spring Math (Computation & Application) Benchmark testing.

2014/15, 81.7% of students scored average and above on School-Wide Spring Math Benchmark testing.
2015/16 Spring Benchmark Target: 83.2% of students scoring average and above on School-Wide Spring Math Benchmark testing.
Performance:

Prior Year Target: *Writing Target*

1.5% year-year increase between 2014/15 and 2015/16 on School-Wide Spring Spelling Benchmark testing:

2014/15, 85.8% of students scored average and above on School-Wide Spring Spelling Benchmark testing.

2015/16 Spring Benchmark Target: 87.3% of students scoring average and above on School-Wide Spring Spelling Benchmark testing.

Performance:

Academic Achievement (Status) Reflection

The school-wide performance on literacy and math benchmark testing for the fall, winter, and spring testing for the last two school years is below. The benchmark is 75% of students scoring average or above on national norms, highlighted green.

The performance targets for K-12 literacy, math, and spelling was based on 1.5% year to year growth from Spring 2015 to Spring 2016 benchmark testing.

Spring 2016 K-12 Literacy Target: 83% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

Spring 2016 K-12 Math Target: 83.2% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

Spring 2016 K-12 Spelling Target: 87.3% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

2014/15

	K-12 Literacy Fluency and Comprehension	K-12 Math Application and Computation	SPELLING .
Spring	81.5%	81.7%	85.8%

2015/16

	K-12 Literacy Fluency and Comprehension	K-12 Math Application and Computation	SPELLING .
Fall	74.6%	81.6%	86.4%
Winter	75.6%	81.3%	88.0%
Spring	80.4%	79.2%	85.4%
Year Delta:	+5.8%	-2.4%	-1.0%
2015/16 EOY Year-Year change:	-1.1%	-2.5%	-0.4%

The 2015/16 school-wide target for literacy of 83% of students at grade level <mark>was not met</mark> with **80.4% of students performing at average or above** on reading fluency and comprehension (averaged, 87.1% and 75.9%, respectively) on spring 2016 benchmark testing. The school-wide performance was 0.9% below target.

The 2015/16 school-wide target for math of 83.2% of students at grade level <mark>was not met</mark> with **79.2% of students performing at average or above** on math computation and application (averaged, 83.3% and 80.3%, respectively) on spring benchmark testing. The school-wide performance was 3% below target.

The 2015/16 school wide-target for writing of 87.3% <mark>was not met</mark> with **85.4% of students performing at average or above** on spelling, the closest benchmark assessment indicator available, on spring benchmark testing. The school-wide performance was 1.9% below target.

Performance Indicator: Academic Growth

Prior Year Target: *Reading Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2014/15 and 2015/16 on Reading (Fluency & Comprehension) Spring Benchmark testing.*
Performance:

Prior Year Target: *Math Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2014/15 and 2015/16 on Math (Computation & Application) Spring Benchmark testing.*
Performance:

Prior Year Target: *Writing Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2014/15 and 2015/16 on Writing (Spelling) Spring Benchmark testing.*
Performance:

Academic Growth Reflection

The academic growth targets for K-12 literacy, math, and spelling was 1.5% year to year growth from Spring 2015 to Spring 2016 benchmark testing.

Spring 2015 K-12 Literacy Data: 81.5% of students scoring average or above on norm-referenced testing
Spring 2016 K-12 Literacy Target: *1.5% year to year growth: 83% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing*

Spring 2015 K-12 Math Data: 81.7% of students scoring average or above on norm-referenced testing

Spring 2016 K-12 Math Target: *1.5% year to year growth: 83.2% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing*

Spring 2015 K-12 Spelling Data: 85.8% of students scoring average or above on norm-referenced testing
Spring 2016 K-12 Spelling Target: *1.5% year to year growth: 87.3% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing*

The 2015/16 school-wide growth target for literacy of 1.5% year to year growth of students at grade level **was not met** *with **1.1% decrease** on year to year in K-12 literacy (reading fluency and comprehension averaged) on spring 2016 benchmark testing.*

The 2015/16 school-wide growth target for math of 1.5% year to year growth of students at grade level **was not met** *with **2.5% decrease** on year to year in K-12 math (computation and application averaged) on spring 2016 benchmark testing.*

The 2015/16 school wide-target for spelling of 1.5% year to year growth of students at grade level **was not met** *with **0.4% decrease** on year to year K-12 spelling on spring 2016 benchmark testing.*

Performance Indicator: Academic Growth Gaps

*****Prior Year Target:*** *Student with Disabilities:*
Student Performance data per student plan acc./mod. and school-wide avg. performance percentiles on student IEP plan goals, 2015/16 target: 85% of stud. with IEPs/504s passing all classes and 100% of achievement on student plan goals

ELD: 10% annual increase in Reading benchmark
FRL: N.A.
*****Performance:***

Academic Growth Gaps Reflection

Performance Indicator: Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

*****Prior Year Target:*** *100% graduation rate*
*****Performance:*** *This was met with 100% of seniors graduating in the 2015/16 school year.*

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness Reflection

Current Performance

Provide a description of the trend analysis that includes at least three years of data (state and local data). Trend statements should be provided in the four performance indicator areas and by disaggregated groups. Trend statements should include the direction of the trend and a comparison (e.g. state expectations, state average) to indicate why the trend is notable.

The school-wide performance on literacy, math and spelling benchmark testing for the 2016 Spring testing is below. The benchmark is 75% of students scoring average or above on national norms, highlighted in green.

2015/2016		
K-12 Literacy	*K-12 Math*	*K - 12 Spelling*
Fluency and Comprehension	*Application and Computation.*	
Spring `80.4%`	`79.2%`	`85.4%`

PARCC/CMAS

The results of PARCC testing in the Springs of 2015 and 2016 for LCS are given here by school level:

Subject Area Tested	*School Level*	*2015 Met/Exceeded (%)*	*2016 Met/Exceeded (%)*
English Lang. Arts	Elem (3-5)	37	30
English Lang. Arts	MS (6 - 8)	27	25
English Lang. Arts	HS (9)	39	41
Math	Elem (3-5)	28	22
Math	MS (6&7)	24	
Math	MS (6-8)		22

READ Plan:
In the Fall of 2015, LCS had 36 students that qualified as SRD (Severe Reading Deficient) for the READ Plan.
In the Spring of 2016, LCS had 42 students that qualified as SRD (Severe Reading Deficient) for the READ Plan.
Over the course of the 2015/16 school year, 10 students were removed from SRD status under the READ Plan.

Trend Analysis

Review the DPF and local data. Document any areas where the school did not at least meet state/federal expectations.

Performance Indicator: Academic Achievement (Status)

Elementary Math From the 2013/14 3-year SPF: 68.3% P/A, approaching status From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 80.1% average or above From the 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 75.7% average or above

Trend Direction: **Increasing then decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes**

Middle School Literacy From the 2013/14 3-year SPF: 78.4% P/A, meets status From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 84.5% average or above From the 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 76.5% average or above

Trend Direction: **Increasing then decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes**

Middle School Math From the 2013/14 SPF: 50.2% P/A, approaching status From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 89.2% average or above From the 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 82.8% average or above

Trend Direction: **Increasing then decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes**

High School Literacy From the 2013/14 3-year SPF: 71.4% P/A, approaching status From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency and Comprehension): 84.2% average or above From the 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency and Comprehension): 89.2% average or above

Trend Direction: **Increasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes**

High School Math From the 2013/14 3-year SPF: 31.4% P/A, meets status From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 75.9% average or above From the 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 82.3% average or above

*Trend Direction: **Increasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes***

Elementary PARCC/CMAS Data Results - English Language Arts: Spring 2015 (3-5) - 37% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (3-5) - 30% Met or Exceeded Expectations

Trend Direction: - Notable Trend:

Middle School PARCC/CMAS Data Results - English Language Arts: Spring 2015 (6-8) - 27% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (6-8) - 25% Met or Exceeded Expectations

Trend Direction: - Notable Trend:

High School PARCC/CMAS Data Results - English Language Arts: Spring 2015 (9) - 39% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (9) - 41% Met or Exceeded Expectations

Trend Direction: - Notable Trend:

Elementary PARCC/CMAS Data Results - Math: Spring 2015 (3-5) - 28% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (3-5) - 22% Met or Exceeded Expectations

Trend Direction: - Notable Trend:

Middle School PARCC/CMAS Data Results - Math: Spring 2015 (6&7) - 24% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (6-8) - 22% Met or Exceeded Expectations

Trend Direction: - Notable Trend:

Performance Indicator: Academic Growth

Elementary Math From the 2014/15 Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 0.55% increase over the year From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 3.6% decrease over the year

*Trend Direction: **Increasing then decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes***

High School Literacy From the 2014/15 Benchmark Data (Fluency and Comprehension): 2.0% decrease over the year From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Fluency and Comprehension):3.0% decrease over the year

*Trend Direction: **Decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes***

School-Wide Math From the 2014/15 Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 3.0% decrease over the course of the year From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 1.9% decrease over the course of the year

*Trend Direction: **Decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes***

Performance Indicator: Academic Growth Gaps

Performance Indicator: Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

Additional Trend Information:

Priority Performance Challenges and Root Cause Analysis

Review the DPF and local data. Document any areas where the school did not at least meet state/federal expectations. Priority Performance Challenges and Root Cause Analysis Priority Performance Challenges: Identify notable trends (or a combination of trends) that are the highest priority to address (priority performance challenges). No more than 3-5 are recommended. Provide a rationale for why these challenges have been selected and address the magnitude of the school's overall performance challenges. Root Cause: Identify at least one root cause for every priority performance challenge. Root causes should address adult actions, be under the control of the school, and address the priority performance challenge(s). Provide evidence that the root cause was verified through the use of additional data. A description of the selection process for the corresponding major improvement strategies is recommended.

Relationship of UIP Elements

Priority Performance Challenges   Root Cause

Elementary Math (Computation and Application)	Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program

Middle School Math (Computation and Application)

Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework
Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program

Middle School Literacy (Fluency and Comprehension)

Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework
Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program

Provide a rationale for why these challenges have been selected and address the magnitude of the overall performance challenges:

Two of the three Performance Challenges involve the improvement of Math performance in the formative school levels of Elementary and Middle School. These are the foundational years in math skills development. For both of these school levels, the Notable Trends are similar - student performance rising during the 2014-2015 school years comparison (Spring testing sessions), but declining the following 2015 - 2016 school years comparison (again, Spring testing sessions).

For the three content areas reviewed for the Trend Analysis (Literacy, Math and Writing), in the most recent window of Spring 2016 Benchmark testing in the Elementary, the Math results indicated the lowest level of relative achievement (L-80.5,M-75.7,W-75.9). This led to the determination of Math being a content area in Elementary being a Performance Challenge.

Math has been a content area that has been a target for improvement in previous years. The selection of the Elementary school's math program for a Performance Challenge will continue the focus on this essential area.

Within the formative Middle School, both the Math and Literacy content areas indicated similar drops in the second year of the analysis, compared with the first year of this three year review. This indicates how these two areas in Middle School are Performance Challenges.

In addition, the decline in PARCC/CMAS results for all three of the areas which have been identified (Elementary Math, Middle School Math and Literacy) indicated a decline between the first 2 years of that assessment program. This emphasized the need to focus on these three specific school level-content level Performance Challenges given this most recent pattern. Further, this will be an essential assessment system to perform well on for the school's students' given the importance for most school ratings.

Student Participation Rates:
A further consideration in looking at PARCC/CMAS results, and the difference in level of performance compared to benchmark data, is related to the relatively low participation in the revised state testing and PARCC/CMAS framework, with 77.8% participation in ELA, 79.2% participation in math, and 69.8% participation in science. There is also a correlation with the students' families who opt-out, and level of involvement of those parents, and on the whole, level of performance of the student. As an example, several of the students who were advanced to higher grade levels in math did not take the math PARCC test, and similarly with analysis of students who opted out, and their relatively high performance on their student's benchmark results.

Continued efforts in educating and communicating to our families on the need for participation will continue, as well as the possible effects towards

the school's SPF rating and state accountability expectations.

Provide a rationale for how these Root Causes were selected and verified:

Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework - LCS' classical curriculum incorporates the Core Knowledge and Singapore Math curricula. The consistency in lower performance on the PARCC state testing is attributed to the difference in grade level expectations from LCS' curricula and the state standards as well as the lack of student exposure to the revised PARCC computer-based framework and question types.

Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program - Targeted intervention supports have been implemented towards elementary literacy in 2014/15 and 2015/16, and there was growth in year-year Spring benchmark testing for K-5 literacy (75.7% students average and above compared to 80.5% students average and above). The need for expanded and consistent intervention programs is a major root cause for the priority performance challenge for LCS' middle school for math and literacy to allow for similar growth seen in elementary literacy.

Additional Narrative / Conclusion

Action Plans

School Target Setting

Directions: Schools are expected to set their own annual targets for academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps, and postsecondary and workforce readiness. At a minimum, schools should set targets for each of the performance indicators where state expectations are not met; targets should also be connected to prioritized performance challenges. For each annual performance target, identify interim measures that will be used to monitor progress toward the annual targets at least quarterly during the school year.

Academic Achievement (Status)

Measures / Metrics:	R
Priority Performance Challenge:	

Annual Performance Targets	**2016-2017:**	Literacy Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on School-Wide Spring Literacy (Fluency & Comprehension) Benchmark testing. 2015/16, 80.4% of students scored average and above on School-Wide Spring Literacy Benchmark testing. 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Target: 81.9% of students scoring average or above on School-Wide Spring Literacy Benchmark testing.
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Aimsweb K-12, DIBELS K-5

Measures / Metrics:	M
Priority Performance Challenge:	

Annual Performance Targets	**2016-2017:**	Math Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on School-Wide Spring Math (Computation & Application) Benchmark testing. 2015/16, 79.2% of students scored average and above on School-Wide Spring Math Benchmark testing. 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Target: 80.7% of students scoring average and above on School-Wide Spring Math Benchmark testing.
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Aimsweb K-12

Measures / Metrics:	W

	Priority Performance Challenge:	
Annual Performance Targets	**2016-2017:**	Writing Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on School-Wide Spring Writing (Composition) and Spelling Benchmark testing: 2015/16, 85.4% of students scored average and above on School-Wide Spring Spelling Benchmark testing. 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Target: 86.9% of students scoring average and above on School-Wide Spring Spelling Benchmark testing. 2015/16, 77.6% of students scored average and above on School-Wide Spring Writing (Composition) Benchmark testing. 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Target: 79.1% of students scoring average and above on School-Wide Spring Writing (Composition) Benchmark testing.
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Aimsweb K-12

Academic Growth

	Measures / Metrics:	R
	Priority Performance Challenge:	
Annual Performance Targets	**2016-2017:**	Reading Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on Literacy (Fluency & Comprehension) Spring Benchmark testing.
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Aimsweb K-12, DIBELS K-5

	Measures / Metrics:	M
	Priority Performance Challenge:	
Annual	**2016-2017:**	Math Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on Math

Performance Targets		(Computation & Application) Spring Benchmark testing.
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Aimsweb K-12

Measures / Metrics:		W
Priority Performance Challenge:		
Annual Performance Targets	2016-2017:	Writing Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on Spelling and Writing (writing composition) Spring Benchmark testing.
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Aimsweb K-12

Academic Growth Gaps

Measures / Metrics:		
Priority Performance Challenge:		
Annual Performance Targets	2016-2017:	Student with Disabilities: Student Performance data per student plan acc./mod. and school-wide avg. performance percentiles on student IEP plan goals. 2016/17 target: 90% of stud. w/ IEPs/504s passing all classes and 100% of achievement on student plan goals ELD: 10% annual increase in Reading benchmark FRL: N.A.
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Student performance and growth per IEP plans.

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

Measures / Metrics:	Graduation Rate
Priority Performance Challenge:	

Annual Performance Targets	**2016-2017:**	100% graduation rate
	2017-2018:	
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		

Planning Form

Major Improvement Strategy Name:	Continued Expansion of Targeted Intervention Support
Major Improvement Strategy Description:	In 2014/15, intervention support was implemented in elementary literacy and middle school math, and elementary literacy experienced a 4.0% annual increase and middle school math experienced a 5.1% annual increase. In 2015/16, elementary literacy experienced a 4.8% increase year-year. With additional FTE available, both literacy and math intervention strategies will be spread to the rest of the K-12 program based on the 2014/15 strategy implemented.

Associated Root Causes:

Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program: LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and an improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing.

Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status	School Year	

Implementation Benchmark Associated with MIS

Action Step Name (Association)	IB Name	Description	Start/End/Repeats	Key Personnel	Status	School Year

Major Improvement Strategy Name:	Further Student Exposure to Revised State and PARCC Expectations
Major Improvement Strategy Description:	A major area of focus to target growth in literacy and math is to coordinate teacher accountability on instructing towards the grade level standards on LCS' Scope and Sequence with lesson and unit preparation. Much work was completed by LCS' teachers in developing and mapping a comparison of LCS' standards (tied to LCS' Core Knowledge, Singapore Math and Classical curricula) to the state's standards. The next step is consistent application of LCS' standards toward classroom instruction, as seen as teacher communication of LCS Standards (which are to meet and exceed the state's) covered in lesson plans turned in on a weekly basis.

Associated Root Causes:

Amount of Alignment to State Standards and Student Exposure to PARCC framework: LCS' classical curriculum incorporates the Core Knowledge and Singapore Math curricula. More work towards aligning LCS' curriculum and the revised state standards, and teacher implementation, is a major strategy. Further, LCS' students do not have previous exposure to the PARCC computer-based framework and question types before testing.

Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status	School Year	

Implementation Benchmark Associated with MIS

Action Step Name (Association)	IB Name	Description	Start/End/Repeats	Key Personnel	Status	School Year

Addenda

Attachments List