



# Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for Schools

**LOVELAND CLASSICAL SCHOOL UIP 2017-18** | School: LOVELAND CLASSICAL SCHOOL | District: THOMPSON R2-J | Org ID: 1560 | School ID: 5235  
| Framework: Performance Plan: Low Participation | Draft UIP

## Table of Contents

- Executive Summary
- Improvement Plan Information
- Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification
- Action Plans
- Addenda

## Executive Summary

### If we...

#### **CONTINUED EXPANSION OF TARGETED INTERVENTION SUPPORT**

##### **Description:**

The most significant improvement in the benchmark assessment program for the 2017-2018 school year will be in the assessment used itself. LCS will continue to use the DIBELS assessment system for the lower grades in literacy. This is one of the assessments identified by the state as a way of monitoring progress towards the ongoing goal of Literacy improvement as outlined within the state’s READ program. The DIBELS tool is widely recognized, well researched and will continue to be useful within our benchmark assessment program. For the remaining grades on up through 12th grade in Literacy, Math, and Language Usage, LCS will be utilizing the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) system of assessment. This will be a large step of improvement in quality, consistency and specificity of information available to LCS in order to improve the data available to help guide instruction. The data that will be available to LCS Administration and Board will be useful in comparing results of LCS students to a nationally normed set of student results collected and conveniently organized by NWEA. In addition, to the test results’ usefulness, the test itself is administered uniformly at computer stations for

all grade levels. This will lead to a consistency that will be independent of the personnel that give the test. Besides the benefits to the assessment administration process mentioned here, the data available from MAP will help guide instruction in the classroom, as well as the interventions for the lower performing students. The individual student data allows discretization such that areas for student focus may be identified and applied to individuals' academic needs.



## 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. Further, the focus to reach 95% student participation in state testing.



## NEW HIGHER-QUALITY AND BETTER-ALIGNED BENCHMARKING AND PROGRESS MONITRO

### Description:

Full implementation of NWEA Growth benchmark and Skills progress monitoring grades K-12.



## EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTIONS FOR ESSA, ELEMENTARY STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

### Description:

For elementary students with disabilities subgroup, ELA: Implementation with fidelity for all elementary students with an IEP, the Reading Mastery intervention curriculum via their Resource instruction. Additionally, Orton-Gillingham is a critical component of our elementary literacy program in general education. For the elementary students with disabilities subgroup, math: Singapore Math is the math curriculum in general education, which is reinforce with fidelity for all students with an IEP via their Resource instruction.



[Then we will address...](#)

## 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.

**NEED FOR CONTINUED INCREASE OF TARGETED INTERVENTION STRATEGIES AND PROGRAM****Description:**

LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.

**IMPROVED ALIGNMENT OF CROSS CURRICULAR CONTENT****Description:**

Some lack of focus by teachers on subject content assessed by benchmark testing has been evident. Teachers have not had the plan or motivation to include curricular content within other relevant subject areas. • Conflicts at end of year including tests, projects, state assessments leading to overall impact on Spring testing results.

**LACK OF EXPERIENCE OF STUDENTS WITH ASSESSMENT TOOLS****Description:**

Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.



**Then we will change current trends for students**

## MIDDLE SCHOOL MATH (COMPUTATION AND APPLICATION)

### Description:

Middle School Math (Computation and Application combined) for grades 6-8 had a decrease in the Benchmark testing results between the Spring sessions of 2015, 2016 and 2017. These percentages of students who are at average or above scores were, for those three years, 89.2%, 82.8% and 82.5%. In recent PARCC/CMAS assessments the student performance in Middle School Math (6-8) has declined between the Spring testing sessions with the following results: 2015 - 24%; 2016 - 22% and 2017 - 17% (Met or Exceeded). These trends indicate that this should be a Priority Performance Challenge.



## MIDDLE SCHOOL LITERACY (FLUENCY AND COMPREHENSION)

### Description:

Middle School Literacy (Fluency and Comprehension combined) for grades 6 - 8 had the following results in recent years from the Spring Benchmark testing: From 2014/15: 84.5% average or above. From the 2015/16: 76.5% average or above. From 2016/17: (less 6th gr. Comprehension): 75.3% average or above. In addition, during the 2016/17 school year, middle school literacy saw a 7% decrease from Fall to Spring in the 2016/17 school year, from 82% to 75% of students scoring average or above on national norms.



## ELEMENTARY LITERACY

### Description:

The trend in recent years in the area of Elementary Writing indicates a challenge to the students at this level. Looking at the growth trend - Elementary Writing From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Spelling): 0.28% increase over the year. From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 1.5% decrease over the year. From the 2016/17 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 4% decrease between the Fall and Winter (last testing session available) testing sessions. This does show a change in the emphasis to be applied in the Elementary school as recent data indicates the identification of the literacy area being the Priority Performance Challenge has to be modified since the trend in that area is now positive. Hence, for the area of Academic Status in the Elementary school, Elementary Literacy From 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 75.7% average or above. From 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 80.5% average or above. From 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 81.4% average or above.



## ELEMENTARY MATH

**Description:**

Elementary PARCC/CMAS Data Results - Math: Spring 2015 (3-5) - 28% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (3-5) - 22% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2017 (3-5) - 20% Met or Exceeded Expectations

**ESSA, ELEMENTARY STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES****Description:**

ESSA, elementary students with disabilities The Academic Achievement and Academic Growth performance for the student with disabilities student group in the elementary is a priority performance challenge. The trend of Does Not Meet on the 3-year 2017 UIP and the three consecutive 1-year UIPs relays that more attention is needed regarding supporting the performance on the state CMAS/PARCC testing. Although the meeting of IEP goals and implementation of IEP accommodations and modifications is fully in place at a high degree at LCS (per analysis of external entities, such as the Thompson School District), a renewed focus regarding the performance of the elementary students in this student group on the state testing framework is required to ensure that their needs are being met, and it is an area of focus for this Unified Improvement Plan.



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

## Improvement Plan Information

### Additional Information about the school

Loveland Classical Schools is a K-12 classical charter school entering its sixth 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.

In the first six years of existence, LCS has grown to a full K-12 school serving approximately 864 students as of Fall 2017. From 2011-2014, the first 3 years of LCS operations, LCS averaged 10.2% year-year growth on the CDE's School Performance Framework, maintaining the "Performance" status since that year.

LCS' 2017/18 demographics are as follows:

Asian %

American Indian %  
Black %  
Hispanic %  
White %  
Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander %  
Multiple Races %  
ELL Students %  
ESS (IEP) Students %  
FRL Students %

The 2017/18 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 2016/17 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 7/11/2017. Once 2016/17 state PARCC and CMAS 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.

---

## Improvement Plan Information

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

State Accreditation

---

## School Contact Information

**Name:** Ian Stout

**Title:** Executive Director

**Mailing Street:** 3015 West 29th St.

**Mailing City / State/ Zip Code:** Loveland Colorado 80538

**Phone:**(970) 541-1507 ext. 2-104

**Email:** istout@lovelandclassical.org

---

## Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification

### Description of school Setting and Process for Data Analysis

Loveland Classical Schools is a K-12 classical charter school entering its sixth 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.

In the first six years of existence, LCS has grown to a full K-12 school serving approximately 864 students as of Fall 2017. From 2011-2014, the first 3 years of LCS operations, LCS averaged 10.2% year-year growth on the CDE's School Performance Framework, maintaining the "Performance" status since that year.

LCS' 2017/18 demographics are as follows:

- Asian 1.0%
- American Indian 0.2%
- Black 0.3%
- Hispanic 11%
- White 87.4%
- Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander 0.1 %
- Multiple Races 3.8%
- ELL Students 2.1%
- ESS (IEP) Students 4.5 %
- FRL Students 30 %

The 2017/18 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 2016/17 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 7/11/2017. Once 2016/17 state PARCC and CMAS 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.

The revised 2017/18 UIP with the **ESSA goals** related to the elementary students with disabilities student group was revised with input from the TSD and school site ESS (exceptional student services) staff, LCS parents via SAC committee, administrative staff, and general education teachers. The revised UIP with ESSA goals was developed in coordination, and reviewed with, TSD district Title and ESS staff in March and with the LCS Board of Directors in the 4/12/2018 board work session.

---

## 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)

<b>Prior Year Target:</b>	<p>Literacy Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on School-Wide Spring Literacy (Fluency &amp; Comprehension) Benchmark testing.</p>
<b>Performance:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>2016/17 Spring Benchmark Performance: 77.90% of students scoring average or above on School-Wide Spring Literacy Benchmark testing.</p>
<b>Prior Year Target:</b>	<p>Math Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on School-Wide Spring Math (Computation &amp; Application) Benchmark testing.</p>
<b>Performance:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>2016/2017 Spring Benchmark Performance: 83.9% of students scoring average or above on School-Wide Spring Literacy Benchmark testing.</p>
<b>Prior Year Target:</b>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>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.</p> <p>2016/2017 Winter Spelling Benchmark Performance (last testing period available for Spelling Benchmark testing): 84.4% of</p>

**Performance:**

students scoring average and above on School-Wide Winter Spelling Benchmark testing.

2016/2017 Winter Writing Benchmark Performance (last Testing period available for Writing Benchmark testing): 75.5% of students scoring average and above on a School-Wide Winter Writing (Composition) Benchmark testing.

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 2016 to Spring 2017 benchmark testing.

Spring 2017 K-12 Literacy Target: 81.9% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

Spring 2017 K-12 Math Target: 80.7% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

Winter 2017 K-12 Spelling Target: 86.9% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

**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%	86.0%
Spring	80.4%	79.2%	85.4%

**2016/17**

	K-12 Literacy Fluency and	K-12 Math Application and	SPELLING

**ACADEMIC  
ACHIEVEMENT  
(STATUS)  
REFLECTION:**

	Comprehension	Computation	
Fall	92.7%	92.4%	95.5%
Winter	83.5%	78.9%	84.4%
Spring	78.9%	81.9%	-----
Year Delta:	-3.8%	-0.5%	----
2016/17 EOY Year-Year change:	-1.5%	+2.7%	-----

The 2016/17 school-wide target for literacy of 81.9% of students at grade level **was not met** with 78.9% of **students performing at average or above** on reading fluency and comprehension on spring 2017 benchmark testing. The school-wide performance was 3.0% below target.

The 2016/17 school-wide target for math of 80.7% of students at grade level **was met** with 81.9% of **students performing at average or above** on math computation and application on spring benchmark testing. The school-wide performance was 1.2% above target.

The 2016/17 school wide-target for writing of 86.9% **was not met** with 84.4% of **students performing at average or above** on spelling, the closest benchmark assessment indicator available, on winter benchmark testing, the closest assessment session available. The school-wide performance was 2.5% below target.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: ACADEMIC GROWTH

**Prior Year Target:** Reading Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on Literacy (Fluency & Comprehension) Spring Benchmark testing.

**Performance:**

**Prior Year Target:** Math Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on Math (Computation & Application) Spring Benchmark testing.

**Performance:**

**Prior Year Target:**

Writing Target 1.5% year-year increase between 2015/16 and 2016/17 on Spelling and Writing (writing composition) Spring Benchmark testing.

**Performance:**

The academic growth targets for K-12 literacy, math, and spelling was 1.5% year to year growth from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 benchmark testing.

Spring 2016 K-12 Literacy Data: 80.4% of students scoring average or above on norm-referenced testing

**Spring 2017 K-12 Literacy Target:** 1.5% year to year growth: 81.9% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

Performance: Spring 2016/17 K-12 Literacy Performance was 78.9%

Spring 2016 K-12 Math Data: 79.2% of students scoring average or above on norm-referenced testing

**Spring 2017 K-12 Math Target:** 1.5% year to year growth: 80.7% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

Performance: Spring 2016/17 K-12 Math Performance was 81.9%

**ACADEMIC**

**GROWTH**

**REFLECTION:**

Spring 2016 K-12 Spelling Data: 85.4% of students scoring average or above on norm-referenced testing

**Spring 2017 K-12 Spelling Target:** 1.5% year to year growth: 86.9% of students at grade level or above on norm-referenced testing

Performance: Winter 2016/17 (closest assessment session available) K-12 Spelling Performance was 84.4%

The 2016/17 school-wide growth target for literacy of 1.5% year to year growth of students at grade level **was not met** with **1.5% decrease** on year to year in K-12 literacy (reading fluency and comprehension averaged) on spring 2017 benchmark testing.

The 2016/17 school-wide growth target for math of 1.5% year to year growth of students at grade level **was met** with **2.7% increase** on year to year in K-12 math (computation and application averaged) on spring 2017 benchmark testing.

The 2016/17 school wide-target for spelling of 1.5% year to year growth of students at grade level **was not met** with **1.0% decrease** in K-12 spelling results as measured from spring 2016 to winter 2017 benchmark testing, the closest assessment available.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: POSTSECONDARY & WORKFORCE READINESS**

**Prior Year Target:** 100% graduation rate

**Performance:**

**Current Performance**

- The school-wide performance on literacy, math and spelling benchmark testing for the 2017 Spring testing is below. The benchmark is 75% of students scoring average or above on national norms, highlighted in green.

**2016/17**

	K-12 Literacy Fluency and Comprehension	K-12 Math Application and Computation	K - 12 Spelling
Spring	76.9%	61.9%	64.4% (Winter testing session)

PARCC/CMAS

The results of PARCC testing in the Springs of 2016 and 2017 for LCS are given here by school level:

<u>Subject Area Tested</u>	<u>School Level</u>	2016 <u>Met/Exceeded (%)</u>	2017 <u>Met/Exceeded (%)</u>
English Lang. Arts	Elem (3-5)	30	29
English Lang. Arts	MS (6 - 8)	25	33
English Lang. Arts	HS (9)	41	51
Math	Elem (3-5)	22	20
Math	MS (6-8)	22	17
Math	HS	Insufficient # of testers to report	

### ESSA, Elem. Students with Disabilities:

On the 2017 3-year UIP, the performance for students with disabilities in the elementary school Did Not Meet for CMAS ELA, CMAS Math under Academic Achievement, and Did Not Meet for CMAS ELA and CMAS Math.

For Academic Achievement, the elementary results for the students with disabilities student group for ELA was in the 1<sup>st</sup> percentile with a mean score of 695.1 and for math was in the 1<sup>st</sup> percentile with a mean score 699.1. In comparison, the ELA mean score for all elementary students was the 29<sup>th</sup> percentile with a mean score 730.5, and the math mean score for all elementary students was the 29<sup>th</sup> percentile with a mean score 726.1.

For Academic Growth, the elementary results for the students with disabilities student group for ELA was in the 25<sup>th</sup> median growth percentile and for math was in the 31<sup>st</sup> median growth percentile. In comparison, the median growth percentile for all elementary students in ELA was the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile, and for all elementary students in math was the 38<sup>th</sup> percentile.

### 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.

In the Spring of 2017, LCS had 35 students that qualified as SRD for the READ Plan.

As of Winter 2017/18 % of students at/above national norms on DIBELS benchmark testing for K-3 READ and early literacy the trends were as follows:

Grade	Fall	Winter	% change
Kindergarten	66%	76%	+10%
1st grade	58%	81%	+23%
2nd grade	71%	78%	+7%
3rd grade	80%	85%	+5%

### Trend Analysis



**Trend Direction:** Stable

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

ESSA, elementary students with disabilities (ELA and Math Academic Achievement)



**Trend Direction:** Decreasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

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 Spring 2016 (6-8) - 17% Met or Exceeded Expectations



**Trend Direction:** Decreasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

Elementary PARCC/CMAS Data Results - Math: Spring 2015 (3-5) - 28% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (3-5) - 22% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2017 (3-5) - 20% Met or Exceeded Expectations



**Trend Direction:** Increasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

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 Spring 2017 (9) - 51% Met or Exceeded Expectations



**Trend Direction:** Increasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

Elementary Literacy From 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 75.7% average or above. From 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 80.5% average or above. From 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 81.4% average or above.

**Trend Direction:** Decreasing



**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

Middle School Literacy 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. From the 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension less 6th gr. Comprehension): 75.3% average or above



**Trend Direction:** Decreasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

Middle School Math 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. From the 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 81.5% average or above.



**Trend Direction:** Increasing then decreasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

High School Literacy 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. From the 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency and Comprehension): 75.6% average or above.



**Trend Direction:** Increasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Achievement (Status)

High School Math 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. From the 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Data (Computation & Application): 89.1% average or above.

**Trend Direction:** Decreasing



**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Growth

Elementary Writing From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Spelling): 0.28% increase over the year. From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 1.5% decrease over the year. From the 2016/17 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 4% decrease between the Fall and Winter (last testing session available) testing sessions.



**Trend Direction:** Decreasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Growth

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. From the 2016/17 Benchmark Data (Fluency and Comprehension): 19% decrease over the year.



**Trend Direction:** Decreasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Growth

School-Wide Literacy From 2014/15 Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 0.04% decrease over the course of the year. From 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 1.2% decrease over the course of the year. From 2016/17 Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 3.8% decrease over the course of the year



**Trend Direction:** Increasing

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Growth

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. From the 2016/17 Benchmark Data (computation & Application): 0.5% decrease over the course of the year.

**Trend Direction:** Decreasing



**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Growth

School-Wide Writing From the 2014/15 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 1.96% increase over the course of the year. From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 1.0% decrease over the course of the year. From the 2016/17 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 2.1% decrease between Fall and Winter testing sessions (Winter was the last session for which data was available).



**Trend Direction:** Stable

**Notable Trend:** Yes

**Performance Indicator Target:** Academic Growth

ESSA, elementary students with disabilities (ELA and Math Academic Growth)

## Root Causes

### Priority Performance Challenge: Middle School Math (Computation and Application)



Middle School Math (Computation and Application combined) for grades 6-8 had a decrease in the Benchmark testing results between the Spring sessions of 2015, 2016 and 2017. These percentages of students who are at average or above scores were, for those three years, 89.2%, 82.8% and 82.5%. In recent PARCC/CMAS assessments the student performance in Middle School Math (6-8) has declined between the Spring testing sessions with the following results: 2015 - 24%; 2016 - 22% and 2017 - 17% (Met or Exceeded). These trends indicate that this should be a Priority Performance Challenge.

#### Root Cause: 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.

#### Root Cause: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program



LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.



**Root Cause: Improved Alignment of Cross Curricular Content**

Some lack of focus by teachers on subject content assessed by benchmark testing has been evident. Teachers have not had the plan or motivation to include curricular content within other relevant subject areas. • Conflicts at end of year including tests, projects, state assessments leading to overall impact on Spring testing results.



**Root Cause: Lack of experience of students with assessment tools**

Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.



**Priority Performance Challenge: Middle School Literacy (Fluency and Comprehension)**

Middle School Literacy (Fluency and Comprehension combined) for grades 6 - 8 had the following results in recent years from the Spring Benchmark testing: From 2014/15: 84.5% average or above. From the 2015/16: 76.5% average or above. From 2016/17: (less 6th gr. Comprehension): 75.3% average or above. In addition, during the 2016/17 school year, middle school literacy saw a 7% decrease from Fall to Spring in the 2016/17 school year, from 82% to 75% of students scoring average or above on national norms.



**Root Cause: 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.



**Root Cause: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program**

LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.



**Root Cause: Improved Alignment of Cross Curricular Content**

Some lack of focus by teachers on subject content assessed by benchmark testing has been evident. Teachers have not had the plan or motivation to include curricular content within other relevant subject areas. • Conflicts at end of year including tests, projects, state assessments leading to overall impact on Spring testing results.



**Root Cause: Lack of experience of students with assessment tools**

Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.

**Priority Performance Challenge: Elementary Literacy**



The trend in recent years in the area of Elementary Writing indicates a challenge to the students at this level. Looking at the growth trend - Elementary Writing From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Spelling): 0.28% increase over the year. From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 1.5% decrease over the year. From the 2016/17 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 4% decrease between the Fall and Winter (last testing session available) testing sessions. This does show a change in the emphasis to be applied in the Elementary school as recent data indicates the identification of the literacy area being the Priority Performance Challenge has to be modified since the trend in that area is now positive. Hence, for the area of Academic Status in the Elementary school, Elementary Literacy From 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 75.7% average or above. From 2015/16 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 80.5% average or above. From 2016/17 Spring Benchmark Data (Fluency & Comprehension): 81.4% average or above.



**Root Cause: 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.



**Root Cause: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program**

LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.



**Root Cause: Improved Alignment of Cross Curricular Content**

Some lack of focus by teachers on subject content assessed by benchmark testing has been evident. Teachers have not had the plan or motivation to include curricular content within other relevant subject areas. • Conflicts at end of year including tests, projects, state assessments leading to overall impact on Spring testing results.

**Root Cause: Lack of experience of students with assessment tools**



Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.



**Priority Performance Challenge: Elementary Math**

Elementary PARCC/CMAS Data Results - Math: Spring 2015 (3-5) - 28% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (3-5) - 22% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2017 (3-5) - 20% Met or Exceeded Expectations



**Root Cause: 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.



**Root Cause: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program**

LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.



**Root Cause: Lack of experience of students with assessment tools**

Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.



**Priority Performance Challenge: ESSA, Elementary Students with Disabilities**

ESSA, elementary students with disabilities The Academic Achievement and Academic Growth performance for the student with disabilities student group in the elementary is a priority performance challenge. The trend of Does Not Meet on the 3-year 2017 UIP and the three consecutive 1-year UIPs relays that more attention is needed regarding supporting the performance on the state CMAS/PARCC testing. Although the meeting of IEP goals and implementation of IEP accommodations and modifications is fully in place at a high degree at LCS (per analysis of external entities, such as the Thompson School District), a renewed focus regarding the performance of the elementary students in this student group on the state testing framework is required to ensure that their needs are being met, and it is an area of focus for this Unified Improvement Plan.



**Root Cause: 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.



**Root Cause: Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program**

LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.



**Root Cause: Improved Alignment of Cross Curricular Content**

Some lack of focus by teachers on subject content assessed by benchmark testing has been evident. Teachers have not had the plan or motivation to include curricular content within other relevant subject areas. • Conflicts at end of year including tests, projects, state assessments leading to overall impact on Spring testing results.



**Root Cause: Lack of experience of students with assessment tools**

Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.

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



Three of the five Performance Challenges involve the improvement in Literacy performance in all of the school levels at Loveland Classical Schools (LCS). Literacy and Writing skills are critically important for students at all school levels, but this is particularly the case as LCS needs to be preparing students for being able to comprehend materials that are provided for the purpose of learning, as well as producing evidence of understanding such that others will know the extent of the knowledge (Writing). This is particularly true for High School students, who with the closeness of the end of their K-12 careers, need to prepare for their immediate futures (many of whom will be attending college).

For the three content areas reviewed for the Trend Analysis (Literacy, Math and Writing), in the most recent windows of Winter and Spring 2017 Benchmark testing in the Elementary, the Writing/Spelling results indicated the lowest level of relative achievement (L-81,M-81.7,S-80,W-76). This led to the determination of Writing being the content area in Elementary that is a Performance Challenge.

Writing has been a content area that has been a target for improvement in previous years. The selection of the Elementary school's Writing and Math programs 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. The drop in student performance per the PARCC/CMAS results in Middle School Math over recent years reinforces the selection of this content area as a Priority Performance Challenge. The decline in these Colorado State standardized test results indicates the need to reinforce the skills and knowledge needed for LCS students to practice more on test taking.

**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 81.6% participation in ELA, 82.2% participation in math, and 73.2% participation in science. All of these participation rates are significantly less than the state standard of 95%. 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.

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.

**ESSA, elementary students with disabilities** The Academic Achievement and Academic Growth performance for the student with disabilities student group in the elementary is a priority performance challenge. The trend of Does Not Meet on the 3-year 2017 UIP and the three consecutive 1-year UIPs relays that more attention is needed regarding supporting the performance on the state CMAS/PARCC testing. Although the meeting of IEP goals and implementation of IEP accommodations and modifications is fully in place at a high degree at LCS (per analysis of external entities, such as the Thompson School District), a renewed focus regarding the performance of the elementary students in this student group on the state testing framework is required to ensure that their needs are being met, and it is an area of focus for this Unified Improvement Plan.

---

**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.

**Improved Alignment of Cross-Curricular Content** - There has not been, up until this year, a concerted effort within LCS to align relevant, viable curriculum between the different classes that have that opportunity. For instance, there is much writing within history classes, but alignment has had to be established with what the English/Literature teachers are incorporating into their classes (related to writing or comprehension strategies) and how the history teachers may make use of these strategies.

**Lack of experience of students with assessment tools** - LCS students have not had as much opportunity to practice with the types of assessment tools that are now being used within schools throughout the state and nation. This has put them at a distinct disadvantage against the other students who are also taking these tests. While the LCS students are competent and accomplished, this has not been born out within the system now used to demonstrate academic skills and knowledge.

**ESSA, elementary students with disabilities** - For all students, consistent lower performance on the PARCC/CMAS testing is attributed to students not being given opportunities to practice with the types of assessment tools that are now being used within schools across the state. This is certainly true for the elementary students with disabilities student group. Further, the school-wide root causes of improved alignment of cross-curricular content (such as to reinforce literacy and math skills in content subjects), increased targeted interventions, and better intentionality of LCS' alignment of the state standards with our curriculum will be of benefit in our efforts to continually improve servicing the particular student group of elementary students with disabilities, and all of our students in general.

---

## Action Plans

### Planning Form



## Continued Expansion of Targeted Intervention Support

**What would success look like:** The most significant improvement in the benchmark assessment program for the 2017-2018 school year will be in the assessment used itself. LCS will continue to use the DIBELS assessment system for the lower grades in literacy. This is one of the assessments identified by the state as a way of monitoring progress towards the ongoing goal of Literacy improvement as outlined within the state's READ program. The DIBELS tool is widely recognized, well researched and will continue to be useful within our benchmark assessment program. For the remaining grades on up through 12th grade in Literacy, Math, and Language Usage, LCS will be utilizing the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) system of assessment. This will be a large step of improvement in quality, consistency and specificity of information available to LCS in order to improve the data available to help guide instruction. The data that will be available to LCS Administration and Board will be useful in comparing results of LCS students to a nationally normed set of student results collected and conveniently organized by NWEA. In addition, to the test results' usefulness, the test itself is administered uniformly at computer stations for all grade levels. This will lead to a consistency that will be independent of the personnel that give the test. Besides the benefits to the assessment administration process mentioned here, the data available from MAP will help guide instruction in the classroom, as well as the interventions for the lower performing students. The individual student data allows discretization such that areas for student focus may be identified and applied to individuals' academic needs.

### 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 continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.

#### Lack of experience of students with assessment tools:



Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.

### Implementation Benchmarks Associated with MIS

IB Name	Description	Start/End/ Repeats	Key Personnel	Status
---------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------	--------



Sustained literacy and math intervention support

LCS uses fall and winter benchmark testing data to group students and provide intervention to target areas of needed support.

09/04/2017  
05/25/2018  
Weekly

Amanda Worrell, Literacy Coach.  
Lindsay Stahl elementary math interventionist, Nick Weeks, MS/HS math interventionist

Met

### Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status
 Targeted Interventions	Implement more comprehensive and effective targeted intervention program	09/15/2017 05/18/2018	Additional personnel better trained and supervised	Kaufman, Boylan, Worrell, Stahl, Brunkhorst, Weeks, Hetrick	In Progress



### Further Student Exposure to Revised State and PARCC Expectations

**What would success look like:** 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. Further, the focus to reach 95% student participation in state testing.

### 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.

**Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program:**



LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.

**Improved Alignment of Cross Curricular Content:**



Some lack of focus by teachers on subject content assessed by benchmark testing has been evident. Teachers have not had the plan or motivation to include curricular content within other relevant subject areas. • Conflicts at end of year including tests, projects, state assessments leading to overall impact on Spring testing results.

**Implementation Benchmarks Associated with MIS**

IB Name	Description	Start/End/Repeats	Key Personnel	Status
 Further Student Exposure to Revised State and PARCC Expectations	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 and implemented in lesson plans turned in on a weekly basis. Further, the focus to reach 95% student participation in state testing. Discussed and reviewed on at least a monthly basis by the Dean of Academics during their teacher observations and coaching discussions.	09/04/2017 05/25/2018 Monthly	LCS Site Principals and the Deans of Academics in coordination with dept. teachers.	Met

**Action Steps Associated with MIS**

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status
 Improved student	Increase amount of alignment between the literacy and math teachers and the content areas taught in by others.	09/15/2017 05/18/2018	time of Principal and teachers to work on better	Kaufman, Boylan, Dept. Heads	In Progress



**New higher-quality and better-aligned benchmarking and progress monitoring**

**What would success look like:** Full implementation of NWEA Growth benchmark and Skills progress monitoring grades K-12.

**Associated Root Causes:**



**Lack of experience of students with assessment tools:**

Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.



**Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program:**

LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.

**Implementation Benchmarks Associated with MIS**

IB Name	Description	Start/End/ Repeats	Key Personnel	Status
 Implementation of Benchmark testing system	NWEA MAP is a new benchmark testing framework for LCS. Successful implementation of fall, winter, and spring testing for 2017/18 to provide more formative and actionable testing information to inform our teachers' instruction towards student growth.	09/18/2017 05/11/2018 Quarterly	Site Principals, test proctors	Met

## Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status
------	-------------	----------------	----------	---------------	--------



### Evidence-based interventions for ESSA, elementary students with disabilities

**What would success look like:** For elementary students with disabilities subgroup, ELA: Implementation with fidelity for all elementary students with an IEP, the Reading Mastery intervention curriculum via their Resource instruction. Additionally, Orton-Gillingham is a critical component of our elementary literacy program in general education. For the elementary students with disabilities subgroup, math: Singapore Math is the math curriculum in general education, which is reinforced with fidelity for all students with an IEP via their Resource instruction.

### Associated Root Causes:



#### Lack of experience of students with assessment tools:

Students have not had much practice with the new testing systems that are used to, in some ways, simulate the State Testing system. Though this is not an end unto itself, it is a significant shortcoming when considering reasons for shortfalls of the LCS program when considering student performance, such as Middle School Math. The use of MAP assessments will help in improving data driven instruction.



#### 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. To the extent possible, this alignment will be implemented so that students will be able to tie in their in class work more with state expectations.



#### Need for Continued Increase of Targeted Intervention Strategies and Program:

LCS began targeted elementary literacy and middle school math in 2014/15, and continues to improve and refine this system. An improvement strategy will be to continue to increase this support to the remainder of the K-12 in math, literacy, and writing. The implementation of MAP Benchmark and Progress Monitoring will assist significantly the strategy of targeted intervention since there will be specific data available to guide this process. Also, alignment will be on the forefront of this process.

## Implementation Benchmarks Associated with MIS

IB Name	Description	Start/End/ Repeats	Key Personnel	Status
 Implementation of Reading Mastery for all students with an elem. IEP	Implementation with fidelity for all elementary students with an IEP, the Reading Mastery intervention curriculum via their Resource instruction. Additionally, Orton-Gillingham is a critical component of our elementary literacy program in general education	01/22/2018 05/22/2019 Weekly	Leslie McFarling, Elementary ESS Resource teacher. Pete Boylan, Elementary Principal.	Partially Met
 Singapore Math reinforced for all elem. students with an IEP	Singapore Math is the math curriculum in general education, which is reinforce with fidelity for all students with an IEP via their Resource instruction.	01/22/2018 05/22/2019 Weekly	Leslie McFarling, Elementary ESS Resource Teacher. Pete Boylan, Elementary Principal.	Partially Met

## Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status
 All elem. students with an IEP reinforcement of Sing. Math curriculum.	Singapore Math is the math curriculum in general education, which is reinforce with fidelity for all students with an IEP via their Resource instruction.	01/22/2018 05/22/2019	Singapore Math curriculum.	Elementary ESS Resource Teacher and Elementary gen. ed. math teachers.	In Progress
 All elem. students	All elementary students with an IEP receiving Reading Mastery intervention curriculum via their Resource instruction. Additionally,		Reading Mastery literacy	Elementary ESS Resource Teacher and Elementary	

with an IEP receiving Reading Mastery literacy intervention	all students receive Orton-Gillingham as the elementary literacy program in general education	01/22/2018 05/22/2019	intervention and Orton Gillingham literacy curriculum	gen. ed. literacy and reading teachers.	In Progress
---	---	--------------------------	---	---	-------------

## School Target Setting



### Priority Performance Challenge : Middle School Math (Computation and Application)



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Achievement (Status)

#### MEASURES / METRICS: M

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** Math Target 1.5% year-year increase between beginning and end of year measurements with new interim assessment benchmark system - NWEA MAP in math. Within the 2016/17 school year, the change in the Middle School for math using the previous benchmark assessment system was -3% (84% to 81%). For school wide results between Spring 2016 to Spring 2017, the percentage of students that were average or above increased from 79.2% to 83.9%. An increase from the beginning to the end of the year will sought of 1.5% within the Middle School average for all students at that school level.

#### 2018-2019:

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring. There should be increases in the average for the Middle School level students achieved that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase.



### Priority Performance Challenge : Middle School Literacy (Fluency and Comprehension)



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Achievement (Status)

#### MEASURES / METRICS: R

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** Reading Target 1.5% year-year increase between beginning and end of year measurements with new interim assessment benchmark system - NWEA MAP in reading. Within the 2016/17 school year, the change in the Middle School for literacy using the previous benchmark assessment system was -7% (82% to 75%). For school wide results between Spring 2016 to Spring 2017, the percentage of students that were average or above increased from 80.4% to 77.9%. A minimum increase from the beginning to the end of the year will be sought of 1.5% within the Middle School average for all students at that school level.

**2018-2019:**

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring. There should be increases in the average for the Middle School level students achieved that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase in the area of Reading.



**Priority Performance Challenge : Elementary Literacy**



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Growth

**MEASURES / METRICS: W**

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** Looking at the growth trend in Elementary Writing, the following is indicated: From the 2014/15 Spring Benchmark Data (Spelling): 0.28% increase over the year. From the 2015/16 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 1.5% decrease over the year. From the 2016/17 Benchmark Data (Spelling): 4% decrease between the Fall and Winter (last testing session available) testing sessions. This pattern shows how there is a growing negative trend within the Elementary students in Writing. A minimum increase from the beginning to the end of the year will be sought of 1.5% within the Elementary average for all students at that school level in the Language Usage assessment.

**2018-2019:**

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring in the area of Language Usage. There should be increases in the average for the Elementary level students achieved that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase in the area of Language Usage.



## Priority Performance Challenge : Elementary Math



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Achievement (Status)

### MEASURES / METRICS: M

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** Looking at the growth trend in Elementary Math, the following is indicated from PARCC elem. Math: Spring 2015 (3-5) - 28% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2016 (3-5) - 22% Met or Exceeded Expectations Spring 2017 (3-5) - 20% Met or Exceeded Expectations. The target is 30% students Met/Exceeds Expectations Elem. Math Spring 2017.

**2018-2019:**

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring in the area of Language Usage. There should be increases in the average for the Elementary level students achieved that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase in the area of Math.



## Priority Performance Challenge : ESSA, Elementary Students with Disabilities



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Achievement (Status)

### MEASURES / METRICS: R

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** From the 2017 3-year UIP, the ELA Mean Scale Score for Elementary students with disabilities student group is 695.1, placing this student group in the 1% percentile ranking and the Does Not Meet rating. For 2017-18, the target for the Elementary students with disabilities subgroup is above the 15th percentile.

**2018-2019:** For 2018-19, the target for Elementary students with disabilities student group is at least above the 30th percentile, with a higher target of above the 50th percentile, Meeting the expectation for this assessment.

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring in the area of Language Usage. There should be increases in the average for the Elementary students with disabilities student group achieved

that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase in the area of Reading.



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Achievement (Status)

**MEASURES / METRICS:** M

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** From the 2017 3-year UIP, the Math Mean Scale Score for the Elementary students with disabilities subgroup is 699.1, placing this subgroup in the 1% percentile ranking and the Does Not Meet rating. For 2017-18, the target for the Elementary students with disabilities student group is above the 15th percentile.

**2018-2019:** For 2018-19, the target for Elementary students with disabilities student group is at least above the 30h percentile, with a higher target of above the 50th percentile, Meeting the expectation for this assessment.

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring in the area of Language Usage. There should be increases in the average for the Elementary students with disabilities student group achieved that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase in the area of Math.



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Growth

**MEASURES / METRICS:** R

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** From the 2017 3-year UIP, the ELA Mean Scale Score for Elementary students with disabilities student group is 695.1, placing this subgroup in the 1% percentile ranking and the Does Not Meet rating. For 2017-18, the target for the Elementary students with disabilities student group is above the 15th percentile.

**2018-2019:** For 2018-19, the target for Elementary students with disabilities student group is at least above the 30h percentile, with a higher target of above the 50th percentile, Meeting the expectation for this assessment.

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring in the area of Language Usage. There should be increases in the average for the Elementary students with disabilities student group achieved that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase in the area of Reading.



**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Growth

---

**MEASURES / METRICS:** M

---

ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS

**2017-2018:** From the 2017 3-year UIP, the ELA Mean Scale Score for Elementary students with disabilities student group is 695.1, placing this subgroup in the 1% percentile ranking and the Does Not Meet rating. For 2017-18, the target for the Elementary students with disabilities student group is above the 15th percentile.

---

**2018-2019:** For 2018-19, the target for Elementary students with disabilities student group is at least above the 30h percentile, with a higher target of above the 50th percentile, Meeting the expectation for this assessment.

---

**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2017-2018:** Using the new NWEA MAP Growth system for benchmarking, there will be three measurements taken during the year: Fall, Winter and Spring in the area of Language Usage. There should be increases in the average for the Elementary students with disabilities student group achieved that is a minimum of 0.75% or half of the targeted 1.5% increase in the area of Math.

---