

# District Profile Of Needs

HLV COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2001-2002  
 Revised January 2002

Date of Next Site Visit: 2005-2006

## GOALS

<b>Student Learning Goals</b>	A graduate of HLV Community School District: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstrates knowledge of basic academic skills</li> <li>2. Demonstrates technological proficiency</li> <li>3. Demonstrates skills necessary to function as a productive citizen</li> <li>4. Demonstrates an understanding of culture/the arts</li> <li>5. Demonstrates critical and creative thinking skills</li> <li>6. Demonstrates an awareness of responsibility in the community</li> </ol>
-------------------------------	--

GOALS	READING	MATH	SCIENCE	OTHER	ACTION PLAN REFERENCE
<b>Long – term</b>	Show an increase in the percentage of all grade levels at the proficient (intermediate) and advanced (high performance) levels.	Same as reading	Same as reading	HLV is also committed to increasing the percentage within subgroups scoring at the proficient and advanced levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Science: pages 13 – 33</li> <li>• Reading: pages 13 – 31</li> <li>• Mathematics: pages 13 – 32</li> </ul>

GOALS	READING	MATH	SCIENCE	OTHER	ACTION PLAN REFERENCE
Annual Improvement (most recent)	4 <sup>th</sup> grade: 72.7% + 8 <sup>th</sup> grade: 63.8% + 11 <sup>th</sup> grade: 65.1% +	4 <sup>th</sup> grade: 75% + 8 <sup>th</sup> grade: 70.3% + 11 <sup>th</sup> grade: 75.8% +	4 <sup>th</sup> grade: 74% +		Pages 13, 31-33
Annual Improvement (last year)	4 <sup>th</sup> grade: +70% 8 <sup>th</sup> grade: +63% 11 <sup>th</sup> grade: +67%	4 <sup>th</sup> grade: 75% + 8 <sup>th</sup> grade: 72% + 11 <sup>th</sup> grade: 77% +	Insufficient data		Pages 13, 31-33
Staff Development	Early dismissals and Phase 3	Early dismissals and Phase 3	Early dismissals and Phase 3		Pages 31-37
Assessment Method	ITBS/ITED ACT Reading assessments MAP	ITBS/ITED ACT MAP	ITBS/ITED ACT MAP		

**ACTION PLANS**

AREAS	(A) READING	(B) MATH	(C) SCIENCE	(D) OTHER
(1) School – Community Planning (P. 4&5 of CSIP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct community needs assessment</li> <li>• Hold community dialogues</li> <li>• Review research</li> <li>• Review mission, vision, beliefs, goals, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct community needs assessment</li> <li>• Hold community dialogues</li> <li>• Review research</li> <li>• Review mission, vision, beliefs, goals, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct community needs assessment</li> <li>• Hold community dialogues</li> <li>• Review research</li> <li>• Review mission, vision, beliefs, goals, etc.</li> </ul>	
(2) Professional Development Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold in-services</li> <li>• Contact GWAEA about a presenter</li> <li>• In-service by Scholastic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set up schedule for class/ in-service</li> <li>• Contact presenters</li> <li>• Hold in-services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop schedule</li> <li>• Arrange for presenter</li> <li>• Conduct in-services</li> </ul>	
(3) Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue BRI and other assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete standards and benchmarks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate topics within curriculum structure</li> <li>• Confer with teachers</li> </ul>	
(4) Diverse Learning Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review multiple selection criteria used for TAG, Title I and At-Risk students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review multiple selection criteria used for TAG, Title I and At-Risk students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review multiple selection criteria used for TAG, Title I and At-Risk students.</li> </ul>	
(5) Inclusive Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AEA consultants</li> <li>• Solution-Focused in-services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AEA consultants</li> <li>• Solution-Focused in-services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AEA consultants</li> <li>• Solution-Focused in-services</li> </ul>	
(6) Media Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue current services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue current services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue current services</li> </ul>	
(7) School Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures of Progress</li> <li>• ICN System</li> <li>• V Ed System</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures of Progress</li> <li>• ICN System</li> <li>• V Ed System</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures of Progress</li> <li>• ICN System</li> <li>• V Ed System</li> </ul>	
(8) Leadership Services				
(9) Management Services				

**PRIORITIES FROM MOST RECENT DISTRICT SERVICE PLAN**

AREAS	READING	MATH	SCIENCE	OTHER
(1) School – Community Planning	Report student achievement data and school information to the public. Develop the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (including Assessment Plan) and the A.P.R.	Report student achievement data and school information to the public. Develop the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (including Assessment Plan) and the A.P.R.	Report student achievement data and school information to the public. Develop the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (including Assessment Plan) and the A.P.R.	Report student achievement data and school information to the public. Develop the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (including Assessment Plan) and the A.P.R.
(2) Professional Development Services	Improve reading instruction	Improve math instruction	Explore multiple measures	MCGF Assistance in developing the teacher compensation programs
(3) Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Services	Refine reading standards and assessments	Refine math standards and assessments		
(4) Diverse Learning Needs				AEA staff will coordinate their schedules In-service staff and consult
(5) Inclusive Schools				Assist in reinforcing a mutually respectful environment
(6) Media Services	The GWAEA professional development library will assist in matching needs with resources. Encourage the use of new library resources and more agency print shop hours.	The GWAEA professional development library will assist in matching needs with resources. Encourage the use of new library resources and more agency print shop hours.	The GWAEA professional development library will assist in matching needs with resources. Encourage the use of new library resources and more agency print shop hours.	The GWAEA professional development library will assist in matching needs with resources. Encourage the use of new library resources and more agency print shop hours.
(7) School Technology	Continue to promote technology as part of the CSI process.	Continue to promote technology as part of the CSI process.	Continue to promote technology as part of the CSI process.	
(8) Leadership Services				Assist in recertification and licensure.
(9) Management Services				Development of hot lunch program. Assist in budget preparations.

District: HLV Community

**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA**  
For  
READING, MATH AND SCIENCE

**ADDITIONAL STATE INDICATORS**

\_\_\_\_\_ 0 % Dropouts – The percentage of students considered dropouts for grades 7 – 12.

\_\_\_\_\_ 81 % Post-Secondary Education – The percentage of high school seniors who intend to pursue post-secondary education/training.

\_\_\_\_\_ 71 % Post-Secondary Success Probability – The percentage of high school students achieving a score or status on a measure indicating probable post-secondary success.

\_\_\_\_\_ 63 % Core Program of Studies – The percentage of high school graduates who completed a core program of four years of English/Language Arts and three or more years each of Math, Science and Social Studies.

**FEEDBACK FROM LAST SITE VISIT**

Date of visit: \_\_\_\_\_

AREAS	SITE VISIT	NONCOMPLIANCE AREAS
Needs Assessment	* The district has enough data available to be able to prioritized educational needs and establish goals for improvement.	* No evidence that a long-range data collection process exists and is used.
Planning	* The district maintains ongoing K-12 curriculum committees for developing and articulating the curricula to support established standards and benchmarks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CSIP contains no evidence of career education incorporated into the total educational program for all students.</li> <li>• The CSIP contains no evidence of technology incorporated into the total educational program.</li> </ul>
Implementation	* The participation of students in various co- and extra-curricular activities is consistently high. Staff and parents interviewed reflected that this participation is a strength of the system and leads to positive student outcomes.	* There is no evidence that staff development activities prepare all employees to implement MC/GF approaches.
Evaluation	* The district is in the process of creating a formal structure to collect, analyze and use data for the assessment of student progress in all curricular areas.	
Reporting	* Parents and students reflected that they receive regular communication about school events and issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district did not report the information contained in the Annual Progress Report, including all of the mandated state indicator information, directly to the community.</li> <li>• The APR did not compare grade level achievement to state and national norms.</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The community has regular access to the ICN.</li> <li>• There are numerous community members serving as volunteers throughout the district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several issues relating to teacher certification.</li> <li>• Several special education non-compliance issues.</li> <li>• Several board policies needing updating or development.</li> </ul>

## FEEDBACK FROM LAST APR

All areas checked OK except the following:

1a. Reading – Met all goals

1a. Math – Met all goals

Achievement Comparison for reading, math and science – Report compares grade level achievement to State norms  
Report compares grade level achievement to National

**Annual Improvement Goal Data****4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 4<sup>th</sup> graders is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the Proficient level on ITBS National Student Percentile Rank. The 2000-2001 goal, as determined by a baseline of 70%, was to have more than 70% of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading students scoring at Proficient or above. Because 77.5% of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at Proficient level or above on the 1999-2001 ITBS, the goal was achieved.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1997-1998</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>
Advanced (High Performance)	18.5%	15.2%	6.5%	12.9%
Proficient (Intermediate)	44.5%	57.6%	64.5%	71%
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)	37.0%	27.2%	29.0%	16.1%

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 72.7%, is to have more than 72.7% of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading students scoring at Proficient or above.

**Annual Improvement Goal Data****8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 8<sup>th</sup> graders is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on ITBS National Student Percentile Rank. The goal, as determined by a baseline of 63%, was to have more than 63% of all 8<sup>th</sup> grade-reading students scoring at Proficient or above. Because 65.7% of all 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading students scored at the Proficient level or above on the 1999-2001 ITBS, the goal was achieved.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1997-1998</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>
Advanced (High Performance)	3.1%	9.5%	5.7%	11.4%
Proficient (Intermediate)	56.3%	54.8%	57.2%	57.1%
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)	40.6%	35.7%	37.1%	31.4%

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 63.8%, is to have more than 63.8% of all 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading students scoring at Proficient or above.

**Annual Improvement Goal Data****11<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 11<sup>th</sup> graders is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on ITED National Student Percentile Rank. The goal, as determined by a baseline of 67%, was to have more than 67% of all 11<sup>th</sup> grade-reading students scoring at Proficient or above. Because 71.7% of all 11<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at or above the Proficient level on the 1999-2001 ITED, the goal was achieved.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1997-1998</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>
Advanced (High Performance)	3.1%	12.5%	14.0%	6.1%
Proficient (Intermediate)	56.3%	55.0%	53.5%	69.7%
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)	40.6%	32.5%	32.5%	24.2%

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 68.3%, is to have more than 68.3% of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at the Proficient level or above.

**Annual Improvement Goal Data**

**4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 4<sup>th</sup> graders is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on ITBS National Student Percentile Rank. The goal, as determined by a baseline of 75%, was to have more than 75% of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade math students scoring at Proficient or above. Because 77.5% of all 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at or above the Proficient level on the 1999-2001 ITBS, the goal was achieved.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1997-1998</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>
Advanced (High Performance)	3.7%	3.0%	29.0%	9.7%
Proficient (Intermediate)	77.8%	60.6%	45.2%	71.0%
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)	18.5%	36.4%	25.8%	19.4%

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 75%, is to have more than 75% of 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at the Proficient level or above.

**Annual Improvement Goal Data**

**8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 8<sup>th</sup> graders is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on ITBS National Student Percentile Rank. The goal, as determined by a baseline of 72%, was to have more than 72% of all 8<sup>th</sup> grade math students scoring at Proficient or above. Because 70.0% of all students scored at or above the Proficient level on the 1999-2001 ITBS, the goal was not achieved. Please see the “math” action plan on the following page to see the district strategies for correcting this.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1997-1998</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>
Advanced (High Performance)	6.1%	11.9%	8.6%	11.4%
Proficient (Intermediate)	75.7%	47.6%	57.1%	62.9%
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)	18.2%	40.5%	34.3%	25.7%

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 70.3%, is to have more than 70.3% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at the Proficient level or above.

**Annual Improvement Goal Data****11<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 11<sup>th</sup> graders is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on ITED National Student Percentile Rank. The goal, as determined by a baseline of 77%, was to have more than 77% of all 11<sup>th</sup> grade math students scoring at Proficient or above. Because only 75.1% of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at the Proficient level or above on the 1999-2001 ITED, the goal was not achieved. Please see “math” action plan on page 17 to see the district strategies for correcting this.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1997-1998</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>
Advanced (High Performance)	29.0%	10.0%	20.9%	9.1%
Proficient (Intermediate)	35.5%	67.5%	53.5%	66.7%
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)	35.5%	22.5%	25.6%	24.2%

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 75.5%, is to have more than 75.5% of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at the Proficient level or above.

**Annual Improvement Goal Data**

**8<sup>th</sup> Grade Science Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 8<sup>th</sup> graders is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on ITBS National Student Percentile Rank. The goal for 2000-2001 will be to increase upon our 1999-2000 average of 82.0% within the next two years. The goal, as determined by a baseline of 76.6%, was to have more than 76.6% of all students scoring at proficient or above. Because 80.4% of all 8<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at the proficient level or above in science on the 1999-2001 ITBS, the goal was met.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>	
Advanced (High Performance)	14.3%	21.5%	12.1%	
Proficient (Intermediate)	57.0%	60.5%	66.7%	
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)	28.7%	18.0%	21.2%	

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 77.3%, is to have more than 77.3% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at the proficient level or above on science.

**Annual Improvement Goal Data**

**11<sup>th</sup> Grade Science Total (all students)**

The annual improvement goal for all 11<sup>th</sup> graders was to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above the proficient level on ITED National Student Percentile Rank. The 1999-2000 score was 67.5%. Because 74% of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at the Proficient level or above, the goal was achieved.

<b>ITBS/ITED National Percentile Rank Data</b>				
<b>Performance Levels</b>	<b>1997-1998</b>	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>
Advanced (High Performance)			18.5%	12.0%
Proficient (Intermediate)			49.0%	62.0%
Partially Proficient (Low Performance)			32.5%	26.0%

The goal for 2001-2002, as determined by a baseline of 70.6%, is to have more than 70.6% of the students score at the Proficient level or higher.