

3231 0000-Johnston Comm School District

APR-Assurances

1. The district has provided individual student achievement reports and grade level performance descriptors from the Iowa Tests to parents. Yes No
2. Even if the district does not currently have ELL students, it has adopted English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for ELL students. Yes No
3. The district has adopted the three achievement levels used by the Iowa Testing Programs, and the alternate achievement standards for the Iowa Alternate Assessment Yes No

APR

Vision, Mission, Goals

1. Is the district accepting Early Intervention funding to be spent on K-3 reading and math?

Yes No

1. Please report on the progress of those goals for 2012-2013.

While the percent of student proficient was up in all three grade spans the growth did not reach the Reading Targets for the 2012-2013 school year.

| Grade | Reading Results 2011-12 | Growth Goal 2012-2013 | Reading Target 2012-2013 | Increase/Decrease | Reading Results 2012-2013 |
|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 3-5 | 88.61% | 5.76% | 94.37% | +1.69% | 90.3% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |
| 6-8 | 83.67% | 9.19% | 92.86% | +1.03% | 84.7% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |
| 11 | 87.90% | 3.70% | 91.60% | +0.10% | 88.0% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |

Â

While the percent of proficient student was up in grades 3 5 it was not a sufficient increase to hit the growth target. The percent of proficient students declined slight in grades 6 -8 and grade 11.

| Grade | Math Results 2011-2012 | Growth Goal 2012-2013 | Math Target 2012-2013 | Increase/Decrease | Math Results 2012-2013 |
|-------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 3-5 | 90.82% | 3.66% | 94.48% | +2.08% | 92.9% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |
| 6-8 | 91.82% | 3.41% | 95.23% | -0.32% | 91.5% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |
| 11 | 90.70% | 1.50% | 92.20% | -1.30% | 89.4% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |

Â

2. Is the district accepting Early Intervention funding to be spent on class size reduction?

Yes No

1. Report how class size reduction funds were used to meet these goals for 2012-2013.

Class size reduction dollars were used to reduce class size by hiring teachers in grades K-2.Â These additional teaching positions resulted in reduced student to teacher ratios.

3. What are the district's measurable, long-range goals to address improvement in reading?

Reading Goals:Â (based on the Iowa Assessments and AYP proficiency data reports)

Goal 1: Students will demonstrate increasing higher levels of proficiency in reading comprehension on the Iowa Assessments.

Long range goal: to reduce the number of nonproficient low SES students in the grade span of 3rd - 5th gradeÂ by 10% annuallyÂ from 22.84% nonproficient in 2012-2013 to 16.65 % nonproficient in 2015-2016.

4. Please provide the district's annual reading goals for 2012-2013.

Annual improvement goals:Â Increase the percent of all proficient students in grades 3-5, 6-8 and 11 annually as measured by the Iowa Tests on the reading test and detailed below.

Reading:

The current state of all students' proficiency rates in grades 3-5 is 90.3%Â up from 88.61% proficient.

In grades 6-8 the proficiency rate is 84.7% up from 83.67% proficient.

In grade 11 the proficiency rate is 88% proficient up from 87.9% proficient.

5. Were the district's annual reading goals met in 2012-2013?

Yes No

1. Since the district did not meet its annual reading goals, please provide the plan to meet future goals.

The District's Framework for Learning provides a focus on curriculum, instruction and assessment. Through professional learning communities (PLCs) staff analyze student learning through asking 1. What is it we expect students to learn? 2. How will we know when students have learned it? 3. How will we respond when students don't learn it? and 4. How will we respond when studentsÂ have already learned it?

All PLCs have developed Improvement Plans directly linked to building improvement targets and to the district Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. These PLC andÂ building plans were developed after a comprehensive review of student achievement data from the Iowa Assessments, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), district performance assessments and classroom formative and summative assessments. Student data was studied by district, building, individual grade levels, subgroups including gender, race, ELL status, Special Education status, Social Economic level, and individual student data.

Continued district emphasis will be placed on linking professional development to student learning

outcomes and differentiating student instruction to meet the needs of all students. Plans call for the implementation of Science note booking and journaling to enhance student processing skills, which links Reading skills with Science skills.. Building Leadership Teams will work in conjunction with district academic coordinators, AEA consultants and teachers in the development of these plans. Implementation data will be collected, studied, and analyzed to ensure instructional strategies are positively affecting student learning. These PLC action plans will gather student learning data and focus on monitoring student learning and developing and implementing interventions to meet the needs of all student regardless of their current achievement level. The district developed a Professional Development Committee comprised of teachers and administrators to review student achievement data, curriculum and professional development implementation data and to plan and deliver research based professional development to address the learning needs of all students.

6. Please provide supporting data to demonstrate the district did or did not meet the annual reading goals in 2012-2013.

While the percent of proficient students was up in all three grade spans the growth did not reach the Reading Targets for the 2012-2013 school year.

| Grade | Reading Results 2011-12 | Growth Goal 2012-2013 | Reading Target 2012-2013 | Increase/Decrease | Reading Results 2012-2013 |
|-------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| 3-5 | 88.61% | 5.76% | 94.37% | +1.69% | 90.3% |
| 6-8 | 83.67% | 9.19% | 92.86% | +1.03% | 84.7% |
| 11 | 87.90% | 3.70% | 91.60% | +0.10% | 88.0% |

7. Please provide the district's annual reading goals for next school year.

Annual improvement goal: to reduce the number of nonproficient low SES students in the grade span of 3rd - 5th grade by 10% annually from 22.84% nonproficient in 2012-2013 to 20.56% nonproficient in 2013-2014.

8. What are the district's measureable, long-range goals to address improvement in mathematics?

Math Goals: (based on the Iowa Assessments and AYP proficiency data reports)

Goal 2: Students will demonstrate increasing higher levels of proficiency in math on the Iowa Assessments.

Long range goal: to reduce the number of nonproficient low SES students in the grade span of 6th - 8th grade by 10% annually from 20.81% nonproficient in 2012-2013 to 15.17 % nonproficient in 2015-2016.

9. Please provide the district's annual mathematics goals for 2012-2013.

Annual improvement goals: Increase the percent of all proficient students in grades 3-5, 6-8 and 11 annually as measured by the Iowa Tests on the math test and detailed below.

Math:

The current state of all students' proficiency rates in grades 3-5 is 92.9% up from 90.82 % proficient.

In grades 6-8 the proficiency rate is 91.5% proficient which is down from 91.82% proficient.

In grade 11 the proficiency rate is 89.4% proficient which is down from 90.70% proficient.

10. Were the district's annual mathematics goals met in 2012-2013?

Yes No

1. Since the district did not meet its annual mathematics goals, please provide the plan to meet future goals.

The District's Framework for Learning provides a focus on curriculum, instruction and assessment. Through professional learning communities (PLCs) staff analyze student learning through asking 1. What is it we expect students to learn? 2. How will we know when students have learned it? 3. How will we respond when students don't learn it? and 4. How will we respond when students have already learned it?

All PLCs have developed Improvement Plans directly linked to building improvement targets and to the district Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. These PLC and building plans were developed after a comprehensive review of student achievement data from the Iowa Assessments, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), district performance assessments and classroom formative and summative assessments. Student data was studied by district, building, individual grade levels, subgroups including gender, race, ELL status, Special Education status, Social Economic level, and individual student data.

Continued district emphasis will be placed on linking professional development to student learning outcomes and differentiating student instruction to meet the needs of all students. Building Leadership Teams will work in conjunction with district academic coordinators, AEA consultants and teachers in the development of these plans. Implementation data will be collected, studied, and analyzed to ensure instructional strategies are positively affecting student learning. These PLC action plans will gather student learning data and focus on monitoring student learning and developing and implementing interventions to meet the needs of all student regardless of their current achievement level. The district developed a Professional Development Committee comprised of teachers and administrators to review student achievement data, curriculum and professional development implementation data and to plan and deliver research based professional development to address the learning needs of all students.

^

11. Please provide supporting data to demonstrate the district did or did not meet the annual mathematics goals in 2012-2013.

While the percent of proficient students was up in grades 3 - 5 it was not a sufficient increase to meet the Math targets for 2012 - 2013. The percent of proficient students declined slight in grades 6 -8 and grade 11.

^

| Grade | Math Results 2011-2012 | Growth Goal 2012-2013 | Math Target 2012-2013 | Increase/Decrease | Math Results 2012-2013 |
|-------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| 3-5 | 90.82% | 3.66% | 94.48% | +2.08% | 92.9% |
| ^ | ^ | ^ | ^ | ^ | ^ |
| 6-8 | 91.82% | 3.41% | 95.23% | -0.32% | 91.5% |
| ^ | ^ | ^ | ^ | ^ | ^ |
| 11 | 90.70% | 1.50% | 92.20% | -1.30% | 89.4% |

^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^

12. Please provide the district's annual mathematics goals for next school year.

Annual goal: to reduce the number of nonproficient low SES students in the grade span of 6th - 8th grade by 10% annually from 20.81% nonproficient in 2012-2013 to 18.73% in the 2013- 2014 school year.

13. What are the district's measureable, long-range goals to address improvement in science?

Science Goals: based on the Iowa Assessments data reports)

Goal 2: Students will demonstrate increasing higher levels of proficiency in science on the Iowa Assessments.

Long range goal: to reduce the number of nonproficient low SES students in the grade span of 6th - 8th grade by 10% annually from 35.78% nonproficient in 2012-2013 to 26.08 % nonproficient in 2015-2016.

14. Please provide the district's annual science goals for 2012-2013.

Annual Improvement Goals – Increase the percent of proficient students in grades 3-5, 6-8 and 11 annually as measured by the Iowa Tests on the Science subtest.

Science:

The current state of all students' proficiency rates in grades 3-5 is 93.7% up from 92.46% proficient.

In grades 6-8 the proficiency rate is 87.2% proficient up from 86.29% proficient.

In grade 11 the proficiency rate is 92.1% proficient which is down slightly from 93.0% proficient.

15. Were the district's annual science goals met in 2012-2013?

Yes No

1. Since the district did not meet its annual science goals, please provide the plan to meet future goals.

The Johnston Community School District's school improvement process has again been reviewed and refined to focus on student learning. The District's Framework for Learning provides a focus on curriculum, instruction and assessment. Through professional learning communities (PLCs) staff analyze student learning through asking 1. What is it we expect students to learn? 2. How will we know when students have learned it? 3. How will we respond when students don't learn it? and 4. How will we respond when students have already learned it?

All PLCs have developed Improvement Plans directly linked to building improvement targets and to the district Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. These PLC and building plans were developed after a comprehensive review of student achievement data from the Iowa Assessments, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), district performance assessments and classroom formative and summative assessments. Student data was studied by district, building, individual grade levels, subgroups including gender, race,

ELL status, Special Education status, Social Economic level, and individual student data.

Continued district emphasis will be placed on linking professional development to student learning outcomes and differentiating student instruction to meet the needs of all students. Plans call for the implementation of Science note booking and journaling to enhance student processing skills. Building Leadership Teams will work in conjunction with district academic coordinators, AEA consultants and teachers in the development of these plans. Implementation data will be collected, studied, and analyzed to ensure instructional strategies are positively affecting student learning. These PLC action plans will gather student learning data and focus on monitoring student learning and developing and implementing interventions to meet the needs of all student regardless of their current achievement level. The district developed a Professional Development Committee comprised of teachers and administrators to review student achievement data, curriculum and professional development implementation data and to plan and deliver research based professional development to address the learning needs of all students.

16. Please provide supporting data to demonstrate the district did or did not meet the annual science goals in 2012-2013.

While the percent of proficient students was up in grades 3-5 and grades 6 - 8 the increase was not large enough to meet the science growth targets. In grade 11 the percent declined slightly by 0.9% proficient.

| Grade | Science Results 2011-2012 | Growth Goal 2012-2013 | Science Target 2012-2013 | Increase/Decrease | Science Results 2012-2013 |
|-------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| 3-5 | 92.46% | 2.11% | 94.57% | +1.24% | 93.7% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |
| 6-8 | 86.29% | 8.55% | 94.84% | +0.91% | 87.2% |
| Â | Â | Â | Â | Â | Â |
| 11 | 93.00% | 1.00% | 94.00% | -0.9% | 92.1% |

17. Please provide the district's annual science goals for next school year.

Annual goal: to reduce the number of nonproficient low SES students in the grade span of 6th - 8th grade by 10% annually from 35.78% nonproficient in 2012-2013 to 32.20% in the 2013- 2014 school year.

Learning Environment

18. Please describe the district's locally defined indicators.

District Learning Goals were developed with community, staff, and student input. Performance assessments were created to assess the goals. The assessments require a student response to a problem. Student read a prompt then respond, typically in writing. Some constructed response assessments are short answers while others require detailed responses. Teacher teams score the assessments using a scoring guide that discriminates between different levels of performance. Assessments used are: Grade 3,7 Math, Grade 5,7,9 Writing, Grade 8 Reading, Grade 8,11 Science.

19. Explain the progress the district has made on these indicators.

The results of district performance assessments are as follows:

3rd Math given in March: student proficiency Understanding (solution) 55%, Communication 54%, Strategy and Reasoning 74%,

7th Math given in November: student proficiency Understanding(solution) 94%, Communication 77%,

Strategy/Reasoning 77%,

5th Writing given in March: student proficiency Use of Ideas 75%, Organization 84%, Voice 83%, Word Choice 75%, Sentence Fluency 66%, Conventions 70%.

7th Writing given in November: student proficiency Use of Ideas 85%, Organization 86%, Voice 94%, Word Choice 91%, Sentence Fluency 92%, Conventions 93%.

9th Writing given in December: student proficiency Use of Ideas 91%, Organization 62%, Voice 78%, Word Choice 65%, Sentence Fluency 65%, Conventions 71%.

8th Reading (BRI) given in May: student proficiency Accuracy 100%, Comprehension 98%, Rate 93% @ 133 words/minute

8th Science given in December: student proficiency Multiple Choice Response 79%, Short Answer 69%, Extended Response 67%.

11th Science given in February: student proficiency Multiple Choice Response 89%, Short Answer 84%, Extended Response 53%.

20. Check any of the following assistance mechanisms that the district provided for student athletes in grades 9-12 in 2012-2013:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Classroom teacher interventions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coach interventions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Study hall/study table | <input type="checkbox"/> Tutors |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parent involvement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Classroom interventions |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Problem solving team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Before/after school help |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Counseling services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At-risk program |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Progress reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Monitoring and Accountability

21. Total number of seniors in the district who intend to pursue post-secondary education/training:

321

22. Total number of seniors in the district who have graduated:

379

23. Percent of seniors in the district who intend to pursue post-secondary education/training upon graduating:

84.70000000000000

24. Total number of 7-12 grade students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

9

25. Total number of 7-12 grade students in the district in 2011-2012:

2724

26. Percent of 7-12 grade students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0.33

27. Total number of 7-12 grade female students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

4

28. Total number of 7-12 grade female students in the district in 2011-2012:

1348

29. Percent of 7-12 grade female students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0.3

30. Total number of 7-12 grade male students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

5

31. Total number of 7-12 grade male students in the district in 2011-2012:

1376

32. Percent of 7-12 grade male students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0.36

33. Total number of 7-12 grade White (not of Hispanic origin) students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

7

34. Total number of 7-12 grade White (not of Hispanic origin) students in the district in 2011-2012:

2304

35. Percent of 7-12 grade White (not of Hispanic origin) students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0.3

36. Total number of 7-12 grade Black (not of Hispanic origin) students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

37. Total number of 7-12 grade Black (not of Hispanic origin) students in the district in 2011-2012:

92

38. Percent of 7-12 grade Black (not of Hispanic origin) students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

39. Total number of 7-12 grade Hispanic students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

1

40. Total number of 7-12 grade Hispanic students in the district in 2011-2012:

104

41. Percent of 7-12 grade Hispanic students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0.96

42. Total number of 7-12 grade Asian students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

1

43. Total number of 7-12 grade Asian students in the district in 2011-2012:

131

44. Percent of 7-12 grade Asian students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0.76

45. Total number of 7-12 grade Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

46. Total number of 7-12 grade Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students in the district in 2011-2012:

5

47. Percent of 7-12 grade Hawaiian or Pacific Islander students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

48. Total number of 7-12 grade American Indian or Alaskan Native students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

49. Total number of 7-12 grade American Indian or Alaskan Native students in the district in 2011-2012:

5

50. Percent of 7-12 grade American Indian or Alaskan Native students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

51. Total number of 7-12 grade Multi-racial students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

52. Total number of 7-12 grade Multi-racial students in the district in 2011-2012:

83

53. Percent of 7-12 grade Multi-racial students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

54. Total number of 7-12 grade students with an IEP in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

1

55. Total number of 7-12 grade students with an IEP in the district in 2011-2012:

243

56. Percent of 7-12 grade students with an IEP in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0.41

57. Total number of 7-12 grade English language learner students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

58. Total number of 7-12 grade English language learner students in the district in 2011-2012:

52

59. Percent of 7-12 grade English language learner students in the district who are dropouts in 2011-2012:

0

60. Did the district ONLY use the state accountability assessment to measure annual improvement goals in reading, mathematics, and science for 2012-2013?

Yes No

61. Please use the link below to select the district-wide multiple assessment(s), other than the required state accountability assessment, that the district used to measure student progress in reading in 2012-2013.

| Assessment | Other |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Measures of Academic Progress | |

62. Please explain how the students do on this/these reading assessment(s).

Students in grades 3-11 are given the electronic MAP (Measures of Academic Progress) assessment two times per year. MAP's were given in October and April. Johnston April students' mean score in Reading exceed the national norm group's mean score by at-least 5 RIT score units. For example in third grade the national mean RIT score is a 199.2, Johnston 3rd grade mean RIT score was a 205.6, 4th grade national mean was a 206.7, Johnston 4th grade mean 212, 5th grade national mean was a 212.3, Johnston 5th grade mean 218.2, 6th grade national mean 216.4, Johnston 6th grade mean 222, 7th grade national mean 219.7, Johnston 7th grade mean 227.1, 8th grade national mean 222.4 Johnston 8th grade mean 228.8, 9th grade national mean 222.9, Johnston 9th grade mean 231.1, 10th grade national mean 223.8, Johnston 10th grade mean 231.6, 11th grade national mean 223.7, Johnston 11th grade mean 233.

The fall and spring administration provides teaching staff with pre and post growth data in reading skill development for each school year. Teachers use the MAP data to monitor student learning over the course of the school year and over multiple school years as growth is charted from each testing event.

63. Please use the link below to select the district-wide multiple assessment(s), other than the required state accountability assessment, that the district used to measure student progress in mathematics in 2012-2013.

| Assessment | Other |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Measures of Academic Progress | |

64. Please explain how the students do on this/these math assessment(s).

Students in grades 3-11 are given the electronic MAP (Measures of Academic Progress) assessment two times per year. MAP's were given in October and April. Johnston April students' mean score in Math exceed the national

norm group's mean score by at-least 5 RIT score units. For example in third grade the national mean RIT score is a 203.1, Johnston 3rd grade mean RIT score was a 208.5, 4th grade national mean was a 212.5, Johnston 4th grade mean 221.7, 5th grade national mean was a 221, Johnston 5th grade mean 230.8, 6th grade national mean 225.6, Johnston 6th grade mean 234, 7th grade national mean 230.5, Johnston 7th grade mean 241.1, 8th grade national mean 234.5, Johnston 8th grade mean 242, 9th grade national mean 236, Johnston 9th grade mean 247.9, 10th grade national mean 236.6, Johnston 10th grade mean 250.7, 11th grade national mean 238.3, Johnston 11th grade mean 253.1.

The fall and spring administration provides teaching staff with pre and post growth data in math skill development for each school year. Teachers use the MAP data to monitor student learning over the course of the school year and over multiple school years as growth is charted from each testing event.

^
^
^
^

65. Please use the link below to select the district-wide multiple assessment(s), other than the required state accountability assessment, that the district used to measure student progress in science in 2012-2013.

| Assessment | Other |
|---|-------|
| District Developed Tests; District Wide Assessments | |

66. Please explain how the students do on this/these science assessment(s).

Grade 8 & 11 students are administered a district developed Science performance assessment. Students are given a task to which they are asked to respond in multiple formats including multiple-choice, short answer and extended constructed responses. Teachers are trained in the use of scoring rubrics to analyze student skill proficiency. Additionally, the inter-rater reliability of the teacher scores is monitored to ensure accurate use of the rubrics. Student responses are scored by two to three teacher with the use of a scoring rubric which defines district expectations on district standards and benchmarks.

Seventy-nine percent of 8th grade students were proficient on the multiple-choice items, 69 percent were proficient on the short answer component and 67 percent were proficient on the extended response component of the performance assessment.

Eighty-nine percent of 11th grade students were proficient on the multiple-choice items, 84 percent were proficient on the short answer component and 53 percent were proficient on the extended response component of the performance assessment.

67. Which assessment does the district use as a measure for post-secondary success?

Prefilled ACT data is supplied by ACT International, B.V. and reported at the district level by the Iowa Department of Education.

68. What is the cut score for post-secondary success on the assessment the district uses? This cut score must be 20 if the district uses ACT.

20

69. Total number of 9-12 grade students in the district achieving a score that indicates probable post-secondary success:

406

70. Total number of 9-12 grade students in the district who took the test:

490

71. Percent of 9-12 grade students in the district achieving a score that indicates probable post-secondary success:

82.86

72. All information required for this APR has been or will be reported to the local community.

Yes No

1. Date the required APR content was or will be reported to the community.

9/15/2013
