

Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for Districts for 2012-13 Organization Code: 176 District Name: Denver Language School AU Code: [xxxx] AU Name: [Name] DPF Year: [1-Year/3-Years]

Section I: Summary Information about the District/Consortium

Directions: This section summarizes your district/consortium's performance on the federal and state accountability measures in 2011-12. In the table below, CDE has pre-populated the district/consortium's data in blue text. This data shows the district/consortium's performance in meeting minimum federal and state accountability expectations. Most of the data is pulled from the District Performance Framework (DPF) data. This summary should accompany your improvement plan.

Student Performance Measures for State and Federal Accountability

Performance Indicators	Measures/ Metrics	2011-12 Federal and State Expectations		2011-12 District Results		Results	Meets Expectations?		
			Elem	MS	HS	Elem	MS	HS	
Acadomia	TCAP/CSAP, CoAlt/CSAPA, Lectura, Escritura	R	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	Overall Rating for Academic Achievement:
Academic Achievement	Description: % P+A in reading, writing, math and science	М	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[DPF Rating]
(Status)	Expectation: %P+A is above the 50 th percentile by using 1-year or 3-years of data	W	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	* Consult your District Performance Framework for the ratings for each content area at each level.
		S	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	
	Median Student Growth Percentile Description: Growth in TCAP/CSAP for reading, writing and math and growth in CELApro for English language proficiency Expectation: If district met adequate growth: then median SGP is at or above 45. If district did not meet adequate growth: then median SGP is at or above 55.		Median Adequate Student Growth Percentile (SGP)		Median SGP)	Overall Rating for	
			Elem	MS	HS	Elem	MS	HS	Academic Growth: [DPF
Academic		R	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	Rating]
Growth		М	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	* Consult your District Performance Framework for the ratings for each content area at each level.
		W	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	
		ELP	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	[#]	





Performance Indicators	Measures/ Metrics	2011-12 Federal and State Expectations	2011-12 District Results	Meets Exp	ectations?
Academic Growth Gaps	Median Student Growth Percentile Description: Growth for reading, writing and math by disaggregated groups. Expectation: If disaggregated groups met adequate growth, median SGP is at or above 45. If disaggregated groups did not meet adequate growth, median SGP is at or above 55.	See your district's performance frameworks for listing of median adequate growth expectations for your district's disaggregated groups, including free/reduced lunch eligible, minority students, students with disabilities, English Language Learners and students below proficient.	See your district's performance frameworks for listing of median growth by each disaggregated group.	Overall Rating for [DPF F * Consult your District Framework for the ratin disaggregated group a at each level.	Rating] Performance ngs for each student
	Graduation Rate Expectation: At 80% or above on the best of 4-	At 80% or above	Best of 4-year through 7- year Grad Rate		
	year, 5-year, 6-year or 7-year graduation rate.		[%] using a [4-7] year grad rate		
Post Secondary/ Workforce	Disaggregated Graduation Rate Expectation: At 80% or above on the disaggregated group's best of 4-year, 5-year, 6- year or 7-year graduation rate.	At 80% or above for each disaggregated group	See your district's performance frameworks for listing of 4-year, 5-year, 6- year and 7-year graduation rates for disaggregated groups, including free/reduced lunch eligible, minority students, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners.	[DPF Rating]	Overall Rating for Post Secondary
Readiness	Dropout Rate Expectation: At or below State average overall.	[%]	[%]	[DPF Rating]	Readiness: [DPF Rating]
	Mean ACT Composite Score Expectation: At or above State average	[#]	[#]	[DPF Rating]	

Student Performance Measures for State and Federal Accountability (cont.)



Performance Indicators	Measures/ Metrics	2011-12 Federal and State Expectations	201	11-12 Grantee Results	Meets Expectations?
	AMAO 1 Description: Academic Growth CELApro sub-indicator (median and adequate growth percentiles) rating on the District Performance Framework.	Meets or Exceeds rating on Academic Growth CELApro sub-indicator on District Performance Framework		[Rating]	[Yes/No]
English	AMAO 2 Description: % attaining English proficiency on CELA	7% of students meet AMAO 2 expectations	2 [%]		[Yes/No]
Language Development	AMAO 3 Description: Academic Growth Gaps content sub- indicator ratings (median and adequate growth percentiles in reading, mathematics, and writing) for English Learners; Disaggregated Graduation Rate sub- indicators for English Learners; and Participation Rates for English Learners.	(1) Meets or Exceeds ratings on Academic	R	[Rating]	
and Attainment		Growth Gaps content sub-indicators for English Learners, (2) Meets or Exceeds rating on Disaggregated Graduation Rate sub-indicator for English Learners, and (3) 95% Participation Rate for English	W	[Rating]	
			М	[Rating]	[Yes/No]
			Grad	[Rating]	
		Learners.	Partci- pation	[%]	



Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan

Program	Identification Process	Identification for District	Directions for Completing Improvement Plan				
State Accountability and Grant Pro	State Accountability and Grant Programs						
Recommended Plan Type for State Accreditation	Plan assigned based on district's overall district performance framework score (achievement, growth, growth gaps, postsecondary and workforce readiness)	[Plan Type] [Year]	[Customized Directions] Once the plan type for the district has been finalized, this report will be re-populated in November 2012. Districts with a Turnaround or Priority Improvement plan type must submit a UIP on January 15, 2013 for CDE review. Districts with a Turnaround plan assignment must complete the required addendum for Turnaround districts. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp				
Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District)	District had a graduation rate (1) below 70% in 2007-8, and (2) below 59.5% in 2008-09 and (3) a dropout rate above 8%.	[Yes/No]	[Customized Directions] Districts that need to complete a Student Graduation and Completion Plan must submit a UIP on January 15, 2013 for CDE review. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp				
ESEA and Grant Accountability							
Title IA	Title IA funded Districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan assignment.	[Yes/No]	[Customized Directions] Once plan types for districts have been finalized, this report will be re-populated in November 2012. Identified districts must include the Title I required addendum For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp				
Title IIA	Title IIA funded Districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan assignment.	[Yes/No]	[Customized Directions] Once plan types for districts have been finalized, this report will be re-populated in November 2012. Identified district must include the Title IIA required addendum. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp				
Program Improvement under Title III	District/Consortium missed AMAOs for two consecutive years	[Yes/No]	[Customized Directions] Once improvement status for grantees has been finalized, this report will be re-populated in November 2012. Identified grantees must submit a UIP for review on January 15, 2013 for CDE review. Grantees may use the optional Title III addendum. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp				
Improvement Support Partnership (ISP) or TDIP	Competitive Title I grant to support district improvement through a diagnostic review (i.e., facilitated data analysis, CADI) or an implementation focus (i.e., Best First Instruction, Leadership, Climate and Culture).	[Not a] Title I District Improvement Grant Awardee	[Customized Directions] In addition to the general requirements, grantees are expected to align activities funded through the grant with overall district improvement efforts in the UIP. All grant activities must be included in the action steps of the action plan (e.g., activity, resources). All grantees will be expected to submit the district plan for CDE review by January 15, 2013. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp				



Section II: Improvement Plan Information

Directions: This section should be completed by the district.

Additional Information about the District

Comprehensive Review ar	Comprehensive Review and Selected Grant History					
Related Grant Awards Has the district received a grant that supports the district's improvement efforts? When was the grant awarded?						
CADI	Has (or will) the district participated in a CADI review? If so, when?					
External Evaluator	Has the district(s) partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used.					

Improvement Plan Information

The district/consortium is submitting this improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (check all that apply): Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District)

State Accreditation	
Title III	

- District Partnership Grant
- □ Improvement Support Partnership Grant

Title IA	Title IIA
Other:	

For districts with less than 1,000 students:	This plan is satisfying improvement plan requirements for:	District Only	District and School Level Plans
If schools are included in this plan, attach their	pre-populated reports and provide the names of the schoo	ls:	

	District/Consortium Contact Information (Additional contacts may be added, if needed)				
1	Name and Title	Dr. Sara Amodio - Principal			
	Email	Dr.sara@denverlanguageschool.org			
	Phone	303-557-0852			
	Mailing Address 451 Newport Street, Denver, CO. 80220				
2	Name and Title	Jian Lin – Vice Principal			
	Email	jian@denverlanguageschool.org			
	Phone	303-557-0852			
	Mailing Address	451 Newport Street, Denver, CO. 80220			



This section corresponds with the "evaluate" portion of the continuous improvement cycle. The main outcome is to construct a narrative that describes the process and results of the analysis of the data for your district. The analysis should justify the performance targets and actions proposed in section IV. Two worksheets have been provided to help organize your data analysis for your narrative. This analysis section includes: identifying where the district/consortium did not at least meet minimum state and federal accountability expectations, describing progress toward targets for the prior school year, describing what performance data were used in the analysis of trends, identifying trends and priority performance challenges (negative trends), describing how performance challenges were prioritized, identifying the root causes of performance challenges, describing how the root causes were identified and verified and what data were used, and describing stakeholder involvement in the analysis. Additional guidance on how to engage in the data analysis process is provided in Unified Improvement Planning Handbook.

Worksheet #1: Progress Monitoring of Prior Year's Performance Targets

Directions: This chart supports analysis of progress made towards performance targets set for the 2011-12 school year (last year's plan). While this worksheet should be included in your UIP, the main intent is to record your district/consortium's reflections to help build your data narrative.

Performance Indicators	Targets for 2011-12 school year (Targets set in last year's plan)	Performance in 2011-12? Was the target met? How close was the district in meeting the target?	Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met.
Academic Achievement (Status)			
Academic Growth			
Academic Growth Gaps			
Post Secondary Readiness			
English Language Development and Attainment (AMAOs)			





Worksheet #2: Data Analysis

Directions: This chart supports planning teams in recording and organizing observations about district-level data in preparation for writing the required data narrative. Planning teams should describe positive and negative trends for all of the four performance indicators using at least three years of data and then prioritize the performance challenges (based on notable trends) that the district/consortium will focus its efforts on improving. The root cause analysis and improvement planning efforts in the remainder of the plan should be aimed at addressing the identified priority performance challenges (s). A limited number of priority performance challenges is recommended (no more than 3-5); a performance challenge may apply to multiple performance indicators. At a minimum, priority performance challenges must be identified in any of the four performance indicator areas where minimum state and federal expectations were not met for accountability purposes. Furthermore, districts/consortia are encouraged to consider observations recorded in the "last year's targets" worksheet. Finally, provide a brief description of the root cause analysis for any priority performance challenges. Nou may add rows, as needed.

Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
Academic Achievement (Status)	Table 1, below, shows ELLOPA frequencies and percentages for 49Chinese kindergartners in spring 2011 and 56 Chinese kindergartners in spring 2012 (different cohorts) in four skill areas. An examination of the data shows that there are differences between these cohorts for the speaking skills: almost two-thirds of 2011 kindergartners (63.3%) were at the Junior Novice-Mid level while between two-thirds and three-quarters of 2012 kindergartners (66.1% to 76.8%) were at the Junior Novice-High level. For listening comprehension, more students were at Junior Novice-High and Junior Intermediate-Low level in 2012 than in 2011.	In both Chinese and Spanish programs, we do have students in a variety of levels of language proficiency in target languages.	General Root Causes from both Chinese and Spanish Programs: With a range of language proficiency levels at each grade level, differentiated instruction will continue to be critical to the success of the program with regard to language acquisition. The students who are newer Chinese and Spanish language learners need many opportunities to use communication strategies that are appropriate for their level as they interact with the teachers and with each other both formally and informally about the content they are learning and in social discourse. The classroom teachers should be cognizant of each child's ongoing level of oral language proficiency in order to facilitate continued, challenging language development for each student, integrating Chinese and Spanish instruction at the necessary proficiency levels along with the teaching of content. Vertical growth in language proficiency resembles an inverted pyramid. As proficiency increases, the horizontal growth also increases exponentially with each sublevel. Therefore, vertical growth often takes place at a slower rate as students demonstrate higher levels of proficiency. Students with Chinese or Spanish at home, are transferring from other Chinese or Spanish immersion programs, or have made

cde



Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
	Withered Colorits 2011 and 2012 MA MM MA MA <td></td> <td>exceptional gains in Chinese and Spanish acquisition at DLS alone, need many opportunities not only to maintain their present proficiency level, but also to grow both horizontally and vertically in their language skills. It is recommended that DLS staff will continue to implement instructional strategies that allow for this growth and continue to assess the students' language proficiencies both formally and informally as grades are added to complete the school program.</td>		exceptional gains in Chinese and Spanish acquisition at DLS alone, need many opportunities not only to maintain their present proficiency level, but also to grow both horizontally and vertically in their language skills. It is recommended that DLS staff will continue to implement instructional strategies that allow for this growth and continue to assess the students' language proficiencies both formally and informally as grades are added to complete the school program.



Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
	Table 2 below, shows ELLOPA/SOPA frequencies and percentages for 24 Chinese first graders in Spring 2011 and 53 Chinese first graders in Spring 2012 (different cohorts) in four skill areas. The 2012 Grade 1 results show a broad range of sublevels (JNL to JIH) with the majority of ratings at the JNH or JIL sublevels. The 2011 cohort ratings are distributed across a narrower range (JNM to JIM), with a more students at the JNM, JIL, and JIM levels than in 2012.		



Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
	Table 3, below, shows <i>ELLOPAISOPA</i> frequencies and percentages for 23 Chinese second graders in Spring 2011 and 26 second Chinese graders in Spring 2012 (different cohorts) in four skill areas. For both cohorts, ratings range from JNL to JIH for oral fluency and listening comprehension. The Spring 2012 cohort ratings for grammar and vocabulary have a slightly narrower range than the Spring 2011 cohort, but have higher percentages of ratings at Junior Intermediate level. 		



Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
	<text></text>		



Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
	<text></text>		



Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
Academic Growth			
Academic Growth Gaps			
Post Secondary & Workforce Readiness			



Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes
Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District)			
English Language Development and Attainment (AMAOs)			





Data Narrative for District/Consortium

Directions: Building on the data organized in Worksheet #1 and Worksheet #2, describe the process and results of the data analysis for the district/consortium, including review of prior years' targets, trends, priority performance challenges and root cause analysis. The narrative should address each aspect of the descriptions below. The narrative should not take more than five pages.

Data Narrative for District/Consortium

Description of District(s)	Review Current Performance:	Trend Analysis: Provide a description	Priority Performance Challenges:	Root Cause Analysis Identify at
Setting and Process for	Review the DPF and document	of the trend analysis that includes at	Identify notable trends (or a combination	least one root cause for every
Data Analysis: Provide a	any areas where the district(s)	least three years of data (state and	of trends) that are the highest priority to	priority performance challenge.
very brief description of the	did not meet state/ federal	local data). Trend statements should	address (priority performance	Root causes should address adult
district(s) to set the context	expectations. Consider the	be provided in the four indicator areas	challenges). No more than 3-4 are	actions, be under the control of the
for readers (e.g.,	previous year's progress toward	and by disaggregated groups. Trend	recommended. Provide a rationale for	district, and address the priority
demographics). Include	the district's targets. Identify the	statements should include the direction	why these challenges have been	performance challenge(s). Provide
the general process for	overall magnitude of the	of the trend and a comparison (e.g.,	selected and takes into consideration the	evidence that the root cause was
developing the UIP and	district's performance	state expectations, state average) to	magnitude of the district's over-all	verified through the use of
participants (e.g., SAC).	challenges.	indicate why the trend is notable.	performance challenges.	additional data.
Narrative:				



FOCUS

Section IV: Action Plan(s)

This section addresses the "plan" portion of the continuous improvement cycle. First, you will identify your annual performance targets and the interim measures. This will be documented in the required District/Consortium Target Setting Form below. Then you will move into action planning, which should be captured in the Action Planning Form.

District/Consortium Target Setting Form

Directions: Complete the worksheet below. While districts/consortia may set targets for all performance indicators, at a minimum, they must set targets for those priority performance challenges identified in Section III (e.g., by disaggregated student groups, grade levels, subject areas).

Districts are expected to set their own annual targets for academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps and postsecondary and workforce readiness. At a minimum, districts should set targets for each of the performance indicators where state expectations are not met – in each area where a priority performance challenge was identified; targets should also be connected to prioritized performance challenges. Consider last year's targets (see Worksheet #1) and whether adjustments need to be made. For each annual performance target, identify interim measures that will be used to monitor progress toward the annual targets at least quarterly during the school year.



District/Consortium Target Setting Form

Performance Measures/		Priority Performance	Annual Perfor	Annual Performance Targets		Major Improvement		
Indicators	Indicators Metrics		Challenges	2012-13	2012-13 2013-14		Strategy	
		R						
Academic	TCAP/CSAP, CoAlt/CSAPA,	М						
Achievement (Status)	Lectura, Escritura	W						
	Locitoria	S						
		R						
	Median Student	М						
Academic Growth	Growth Percentile	W						
	(TCAP/CSAP & CELApro)	E L P						
	Median	R						
Academic Growth Gaps	Student Growth	М						
Growin Gups	Percentile	W						
	Graduation Rate	5						
Post Secondary &	Disaggregated Grad Rate							
Workforce Readiness	Dropout Rate							
Mean ACT	Mean ACT							
English	CELA (AMAO 1))						
Language Development	CELA (AMAO 2))						
& Attainment	TCAP (AMAO 3)						





Action Planning Form for 2012-13 and 2013-14

Directions: Identify the major improvement strategy(s) for 2012-13 and 2013-14 that will address the root causes determined in Section III. For each major improvement strategy, identify the root cause(s) that the action steps will help to dissolve. Then, indicate which accountability provision or grant opportunity it will address. In the chart below, provide details about key action steps necessary to implement the major improvement strategy. Details should include the action steps that will be taken to implement the major improvement strategy, a general timeline, resources that will be used to implement the actions, and implementation benchmarks. Add rows in the chart, as needed. While space has been provided for three major improvement strategies, the district/consortium may add other major strategies, as needed.

Major Improvement Strategy #1: _____

Root Cause(s) Addressed: _____

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply): State Accreditation Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District) Title III District Partnership Grant Improvement Support Partnership Grant							
Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline (2012-13 and 2013-2014)	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)		
* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, although completion is recommended. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants (e.g., Tiered Intervention Grant).							





Root Cause(s) Addressed: _____

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply): State Accreditation Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District) Title III District Partnership Grant Improvement Support Partnership Grant							
Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline (2012-13 and 2013-2014)	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)		

Mandatory FORM # OFP-135 EDAC APPROVED Approved 3/2/2012 for 2012-2013





Root Cause(s) Addressed:

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities	nt Graduation and	• •	ated Graduation District)	Title IA Title IIA Other:	
Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline (2012-13 and 2013-2014)	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)

Section V: Appendices

Some districts/consortia will need to provide additional forms to document accountability or grant requirements:

- Additional Requirements for Turnaround Status Under State Accountability (Required for identified districts)
- Districts designated as a Graduation District (Required for identified districts)
- Title IA (Required for Title I funded Districts with a Turnaround or Priority Improvement plan type)
- Title IIA (Required for Title IIA funded Districts with a Turnaround or Priority Improvement plan type)
- Title III (Optional for Grantees identified under Title III)

FORM # OFP-135 EDAC APPROVED

Approved 3/2/2012 for 2012-2013