

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic_10112017_09:12

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic

Lewis County

Jamie L. Weddington
65 Central Elementary
Vanceburg, Kentucky, 41179
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 10/31/2017

Last Modified: 10/31/2017

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	8

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

Rationale: In its most basic form, continuous improvement is about understanding the **current state** and formulating a plan to move to the **desired state**. The comprehensive needs assessment is a culmination of an extensive review of multiple sources of data collected over a period of time (2-3 years). It is to be conducted annually as an essential part of the continuous improvement process and precedes the development of strategic goals (desired state).

The needs assessment requires synthesis and analysis of multiple sources of data and should reach conclusions about the **current state** of the school/district as well as the processes, practices and conditions that contributed to that state.

The needs assessment provides the framework for **all** schools to clearly and honestly identify their most critical areas for improvement that will be addressed later in the planning process through the development of goals, objectives, strategies and activities. **As required by Section 1008 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools must base their program upon a thorough needs assessment.**

Protocol

Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results. Include names of school/district councils, leadership teams and shareholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

The process for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results is multi-layered. Phase One: Schools first analyze data in PLC, grade level, and departments, after looking at results as a whole school. (This year, individual student test results arrived before fall Parent/Teacher conferences; therefore, there was opportunity for teachers, principals, guidance counselors, and students to discuss the students results from the previous year. Since these conversations were conducted 1:1, specific documentation regarding the content of each P/T conversation is not available). These observations and analyses are summarized and prepared for Phase Two, sharing with school councils. Principals and school councils look at and discuss analyses and recommendations from the previous phase and revise or adjust as necessary. (At the district level, instructional personnel review district-wide analyses; district personnel also attend school level meetings as requested). Phase Three: Reporting to the public. Once preliminary data analyses have been conducted, the superintendent reports the district overall results, including trends, to the board of education at an open meeting. Board members in October of 2017, were provided with a presentation packet, outlining Lewis County's successes and ongoing challenges. Each school principal will present his/her school results to the board at a regularly scheduled meeting (usually 1 or two per month from November through February, or until all have presented. The local media is in attendance during board meetings; therefore, reported results are also published in the local newspaper. Over the course of the presentation schedule, an article is run about the district as a whole, then further articles are available after each school has presented). The district uses and will continue to use the KASC score resource booklet to guide data analysis. Once data have been reviewed and analyzed, groups at each school (organization of groups varies by school) prioritize, revise, and draft goals, objectives, strategies, and activities to improve. Principals will meet individually with the superintendent to report on needs, concerns, and progress, which informs planning at the district level. The information collected in school and classroom visits, attendance at grade/team/department or faculty meetings also inform district planning efforts. Once prioritized needs (school and district) are identified, goals are written, etc., school principals present drafts of improvement goals to school councils for input and approval; each BOE member will get a copy of the proposed draft plan for the following year (a week prior to the board meeting where it will be scheduled for discussion and/or approval or revision). Once these steps have been completed, the final step prior to submission to KDE is to post the improvement plans to the school or district website for public comment. (DTC and staff have established a system to collect responses, make them available to the principal or superintendent, and revise as needed). Once the period for public

comment has passed, plans are either further revised and submitted, or simply submitted into the KDE designated platform. *It is critical to note that at any time new, pertinent information becomes available, schools or district personnel will examine, analyze, and possibly revise improvement efforts. The number of times groups meet varies depending upon the organization. The groups mentioned in the process above are members of each school's SBDM council, members of the local BOE. Names and contact information for these groups are available on SRC's and school and district websites. Sources of data include, but are not limited to: SRC/DRC, walkthrough data, KPREP results via KASC graphing service, TELL survey.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Current State

Plainly state the current condition using **precise numbers and percentages as revealed by past, current and multiple sources of data**. These should be based solely on data outcomes. Cite the source of data used.

Example of Current Academic State:

- 32% of non-duplicated gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2015 to 2016.
- 34%% of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 47%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 87% for the 2016 schools year – a decrease from 92% in 2015.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2017 from 276 in 2016.

Lewis County Schools elementary combined reading and math KPREP Data from 2014-2015, 2015-16, and 2016-17 respectively are: 33.1 to 40.4, to 43.0. Scores have fluctuated, and while we have seen an overall, net improvement, we have consistently been below the state average. Lewis County Schools middle school combined reading and math KPREP data from 2014-2015, 2015-16, and 2016-17 respectively are 39.9, 44.4, and 48.4; Lewis County Schools high school combined reading and math KPREP data from 2014-2015, 15-16, and 16-17, respectively are 48.0 to 47.9, and 34.0; scores have consistently been below the state average until the 14-15 school year, and dropped back below the state mean in 15-16, and remain well below most recently in the spring of 2017. K-Prep data indicates the Lewis County School District is below the state average in Reading and Math, across elementary and middle school level configurations and ranges, with the largest gap at the elementary level. KPREP assessment data for science, social studies, writing and language mechanics are similar in that our schools generally score below the state average across the board--in 16-17, however, LC schools scored above the state mean in writing at the elementary and middle school levels. Our schools have greater numbers of novice in many grades and across subjects, as well as smaller percentages of distinguished students than the state averages, although those trends began to change: in 15-16, LCMS had fewer novice than state mean in language mechanics, and the high school had fewer novice in on-demand writing. In 16-17 LC schools saw more exceptions: we had fewer novice than the state mean in: middle school social studies, elementary and middle school writing, and a greater percentage of distinguished in middle school reading, middle school social studies, elementary and middle school writing, and elementary and middle school language mechanics than the state mean. Quality Core EoC tests in English, Algebra II, Biology and US History from 2011-12 to 2016-17, respectively were: English II-39.2 (52.2); 50.6 (55.8), 36.9 (55.4); 60.6 (56.7); 46.7(56.4) and 40.2(55.8);

Algebra II- 36.4 (40.0), 28.0 (36.0), 16.8 (37.9), 35.3 (38.1)47.79(42.3), and 26.2 (38.1); Biology-26.4(30.3),22.5 (36.3), 20.3 (39.8), 29.6 (39.6)and 20 (41.2) ; US History-20.3 (39.5), 34.9 (51.3), and 48.6 (58), and 51.2 (56.8) 53.4(59.1) 50.9(57.5). Novice percentages have fluctuated; in 2013-14 novice increased for all subject areas except US History (where it decreased by half). In 14-15, the percentage of students scoring novice reduced in English II, Algebra II and Biology; percentages of students scoring in the proficient or distinguished range increased in all subject areas. This trend of drastic novice reduction for English, however, was short lived. Biology was not tested in 15-16 due to course sequence reconfiguration. All subject areas were well below the state mean in 16-17. Our ACT scores for English, math, reading, science and overall composite over the past six years are: English- 16.8, 17.2, 17.4, 17.8, 17.9, 18.6; math- 17.4, 18.3, 18.0, 18.3, 18.6, 19.7; reading-17.3, 18.1, 17.9, 18.7, 19.1, 19.3; science- 18.8, 19.0, 19.0, 18.8, 19.3, 19.3; and overall composite- 17.7, 18.3, 18.2, 18.5, 18.9, and 19.4. The percent of students meeting CPE benchmarks for English, math, and reading for the past six years, respectively, are: 43.4, 42.8, 43.5, 49.1, 51.7, 52.3; 27.4, 33.6, 32.9, 35.8,38.8, 51.7; 33.1, 34.9, 32.4, 41.5,43.0, and 43.7. All individual subject indices and percentages of students at or above benchmark are below the state mean, with the exception of math in 2017. NRT results for grades 3-8, in reading, math, science, social studies and language mechanics (where administered) indicate we are below state mean in all subjects and all grades, with the exception of reading and math at the 3rd grade level, and math and Language Mechanics at the 6th grade level. CCR data for the past several years show steady improvement until 14-15, when we saw a slight decrease. CCR rates for the past five years respectively are: 40.8, 57, 65.1, 62.4, and 68.3., and 66.9* (all data corrected during data cleanup does not currently show up on the SRC. 66.9 is the uncorrected 16-17 score. However, since this is what is published, we will include that number as opposed to the 73+ percent the school calculated). The Graduation Rate for the district over the past 4 years is/has been: 96.7, 97.3, 98.1, and 97.7, and 99, exceeding the state average. Nonacademic indicators, attendance, retention, dropout, and transition follow. The attendance rate in Lewis County has ranged from 93.8, 94.0, 93.9, 93.5, 93.9 and 93.7over the past six years. The retention rate in Lewis County has ranged from 0.4, 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.0, and 1.9 and is below the state retention average. Dropout rates in Lewis County from 11-12 to 16-17 were: .2, .6, .3, .3, .6, and .1 respectively; state dropout rates over the past 5 years have been 1.6, 1.7, 1.7, 1.8, and 1.5, and 1.3%. District and state nonacademic data are notably consistent. Teacher perception/working condition results, as reported by the TELL survey (2017), have improved from the results recorded from the 2011 administration. Our response rates in 2013, 2015 and 2017 were 100%. There were some areas that either stayed the same or fluctuated slightly. Two areas of concern under the facilities section were: 1) the availability of educational technology resources, and 2) reliability and speed of internet connections. Both of these areas improved in 2017. There were also some perceived areas for concern under professional development. Specifically, whether or not teachers have sufficient professional learning to implement technology. Overall ratings indicate that our schools are good places to work and learn fluctuated slightly from 90.3% in 2013 to 89.4 in 2015, and 91.7 in 2017— all three years up from 74.1% in 2011. Our work in reducing novice has paid off, almost across the board: all schools and the district made gains. CCR results, graduation rate, and now on-demand writing and language mechanics have been and continue to be areas of relative strength for our district. Strategies that have caused us to be successful to this point will be continued. Our continued weakness, according to the variety of data analyzed, indicates our core programs across subjects and across grade levels have gaps and need to be strengthened.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using **precise numbers and percentages** as revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data points.

Example: 68% of students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

Based upon state test data at all levels and for all subjects, the percent of proficient/distinguished students is as low as 26.2 (high school Algebra II) to a high of 57.6 (middle school social studies). Since no core area in any subject or at any grade nears the 80% mark, it is evident that our core programs are not performing at an optimal level. The percentage of novice learners at the elementary level in reading has decreased from 38.3 in 2014 to 30.4 in 2017. The percentage of novice learners at the elementary level in math has decreased from 33.7 to 22.1; The percentage of novice learners at the middle school level in reading has decreased from 31.8 to 18.1; The percentage of novice learners at the middle school level in math has increased from 20.1 to 22.1. The percentages of gap learners at all levels and across subjects are even higher than the aggregate number of all students.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Trends

Analyzing data trends from the previous two academic years, which academic, cultural and behavioral measures remain significant areas for improvement?

Although the percentage of novice performance has decreased overall, across subjects and levels, the reduction is sporadic, and uneven. Proficient/Distinguished percentages have shown similar patterns--uneven performance over time, at all levels and across subjects.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Potential Source of Problem

Which processes, practices or conditions will the school focus its resources and efforts upon in order to produce the desired changes? Note that all processes, practices and conditions can be linked to the six school improvement strategies outlined below:

[1- Deployment of Standards](#)

[2- Delivery of Instruction](#)

[3- Assessment Literacy](#)

[4- Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results](#)

[5- Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus](#)

[6- Establish a Learning Culture and Environment](#)

All subjects and all grades will revise curriculum maps on an ongoing basis to ensure that the assigned curriculum for each class is congruent to standards. Curriculum pacing guides will be followed, ensuring that all standards have been taught with fidelity to rigorous levels. All principals will monitor the implementation of aligned curricula and evidence-based teaching practices on a regular basis, and will report out in peer groups to ensure that all LC students receive standards and evidence-based learning opportunities. Common assessments, congruent to standards will be administered on a regular basis, on a county-wide schedule. (Assessments will consist of formative, summative, and diagnostic measures that will be tracked longitudinally).

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data.

Example: Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

Graduation rate has remained at 97% or above, exceeding the state mean. On Demand writing is an area of strength, having fewer novice than the state mean (15.2, 13.2% at elementary and middle), as well as having a greater percentage of distinguished than the state mean (8.7 and 18.8% at elementary and middle, respectively). The percentage of students scoring at the Novice level has decreased from the upper 30's (all grade/subject aggregate) to teens or low 20's (all grade/subject aggregate) over the past 2 years. The percentage of students scoring at or above benchmark on ACT have improved across the board: English-43.5-52.3; Math: 32.9-51.7; and Reading- 32.4-43.7 over the past 3 years.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Phase III: Executive Summary for Districts_10112017_09:15

Phase III: Executive Summary for Districts

Lewis County

Jamie L. Weddington
65 Central Elementary
Vanceburg, Kentucky, 41179
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 12/15/2017

Last Modified: 11/29/2017

Status: Open

Phase III: Executive Summary for Districts

Executive Summary

Description of the District

Describe the district size, community/communities, location, and changes it has experienced in the last three years. Include demographic information about the students, staff, and community at large. What unique features and challenges are associated with the community/communities the district serves?

The Lewis County School system serves approximately 2300 students in grades P-12. Recent testing data indicate some hard-earned and notable successes; however, we still have many challenges. The county has a population of 13,870 in an area of 486 square miles. Approximately 75% of the 2300+ students attending Lewis County Schools qualify for free or reduced lunch. All Lewis County schools are Title I eligible (LCHS is not labeled as a Title I school, however). Currently, Lewis County has 125 identified homeless students. Thirty-three percent of the adult population does not have a high school diploma and 23.4% have less than a 9th grade education (2000 U.S. Census). The poverty rate is 23.5% with 68% of the children in Lewis County being welfare recipients (2000 KY Vital Statistic Report). According to OJP Smart System data, approximately 36% of the children in Lewis County live below the poverty level, 14% higher than the state average. Quality of life in Lewis County is mitigated by: 28.2% of residents live below the poverty line; 50% of infants to preschool age live in poverty; 12% of mothers are between the ages of 10-19; 45% of the children in the surrounding communities are in poverty. The Lewis County economy has been crippled over the last few years by the closing of its two major factories, Nine West and Nine West Component Plant, that combined, employed 600 county residents. Despite ongoing efforts to attract new business to the county, there are limited job opportunities, as reflected in the county's unemployment rate of 13%, one of the highest in the state (Lewis Co. Herald, Oct.2011). Just two small factories have located within the county and combined, employ approximately 150 people. One of those has now closed, further reducing the number of employed county residents. Many local parents are involved in retraining programs that create a greater demand for affordable or free supervision and guidance for youth/teens after school and during the summer. The need for after school and summer youth/teen programming is also a concern for those residents that have secured employment, for often both parents are working outside the home and commuting significant distances to those jobs. Nearly 36% of Lewis County parents must travel to surrounding counties to secure employment, and 54.5% of county households have both parents working (2000 Census). Many travel 50 to 100 miles round trip, which of course, extends the amount of time children are unsupervised, especially in the summer. Lewis County youth, particularly teens, are highly vulnerable to negative factors that place these students at risk of academic failure, substance abuse and other behavioral problems. Most of these factors are outgrowths of economic and social problems plaguing their families, including poverty, high levels of unemployment, low levels of educational attainment, welfare dependency, and the increasing frequency of one-parent families. High risk youth are more likely to display a range of negative behaviors: neglect of personal health and hygiene, sexual promiscuity, academic apathy; and drug and alcohol consumption.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

District's Purpose

Provide the district's purpose statement and ancillary content such as mission, vision, values, and/or beliefs.

Describe how the district embodies its purpose through its program offerings and expectations for students.

The Lewis County School system serves approximately 2300 students in grades P-12. We provide a strong preschool program for 3-4 year old's, based on the premise that a good foundation sets the stage for success. Our goal is for all students to have challenging learning experiences as they

move through each grade. Although graduation from high school is an important achievement, our intent is to encourage the development of lifelong learners and instill a desire within our students to continue educational pursuits. This district believes a good education is essential for future success. In order to be successful, we must increase proficiency rates in all curricular content areas and decrease the number of students scoring novice. We must also reduce the achievement gaps in academic performance for students by race, gender, socioeconomic status, and special learning populations.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Notable Achievements and Areas of Improvement

Describe the district's notable achievements and areas of improvement in the last three years. Additionally, describe areas for improvement that the district is striving to achieve in the next three years.

Lewis County Schools elementary combined reading and math KPREP Data from 2014-2015, 2015-16, and 2016-17 respectively are: 33.1 to 40.4, to 43.0. Scores have fluctuated, and while we have seen an overall, net improvement, we have consistently been below the state average. Lewis County Schools middle school combined reading and math KPREP data from 2014-2015, 2015-16, and 2016-17 respectively are 39.9, 44.4, and 48.4; Lewis County Schools high school combined reading and math KPREP data from 2014-2015, 15-16, and 16-17, respectively are 48.0 to 47.9, and 34.0; scores have consistently been below the state average until the 14-15 school year, and dropped back below the state mean in 15-16, and remain well below most recently in the spring of 2017. K-Prep data indicates the Lewis County School District is below the state average in Reading and Math, across elementary and middle school level configurations and ranges, with the largest gap at the elementary level. KPREP assessment data for science, social studies, writing and language mechanics are similar in that our schools generally score below the state average across the board--in 16-17, however, LC schools scored above the state mean in writing at the elementary and middle school levels. Our schools have greater numbers of novice in many grades and across subjects, as well as smaller percentages of distinguished students than the state averages, although those trends began to change: in 15-16, LCMS had fewer novice than state mean in language mechanics, and the high school had fewer novice in on-demand writing. In 16-17 LC schools saw more exceptions: we had fewer novice than the state mean in: middle school social studies, elementary and middle school writing, and a greater percentage of distinguished in middle school reading, middle school social studies, elementary and middle school writing, and elementary and middle school language mechanics than the state mean. Quality Core EoC tests in English, Algebra II, Biology and US History from 2011-12 to 2016-17, respectively were: English II-39.2 (52.2); 50.6 (55.8), 36.9 (55.4); 60.6 (56.7); 46.7(56.4) and 40.2(55.8); Algebra II- 36.4 (40.0), 28.0 (36.0), 16.8 (37.9), 35.3 (38.1)47.79(42.3), and 26.2 (38.1); Biology-26.4(30.3),22.5 (36.3), 20.3 (39.8), 29.6 (39.6)and 20 (41.2) ; US History-20.3 (39.5), 34.9 (51.3), and 48.6 (58), and 51.2 (56.8) 53.4(59.1) 50.9(57.5). Novice percentages have fluctuated; in 2013-14 novice increased for all subject areas except US History (where it decreased by half). In 14-15, the percentage of students scoring novice reduced in English II, Algebra II and Biology; percentages of students scoring in the proficient or distinguished range increased in all subject areas. This trend of drastic novice reduction for English, however, was short lived. Biology was not tested in 15-16 due to course sequence reconfiguration. All subject areas were well below the state mean in 16-17. Our ACT scores for English, math, reading, science and overall composite over the past six years are: English- 16.8, 17.2, 17.4, 17.8, 17.9, 18.6; math- 17.4, 18.3, 18.0, 18.3, 18.6, 19.7; reading-17.3, 18.1, 17.9, 18.7, 19.1, 19.3; science- 18.8, 19.0, 19.0, 18.8, 19.3, 19.3; and overall composite- 17.7, 18.3, 18.2, 18.5, 18.9, and 19.4. The percent of students meeting CPE benchmarks for English, math, and reading for the past six years, respectively, are: 43.4, 42.8, 43.5, 49.1, 51.7, 52.3; 27.4, 33.6, 32.9, 35.8,38.8, 51.7; 33.1, 34.9, 32.4, 41.5,43.0, and 43.7.

All individual subject indices and percentages of students at or above benchmark are below the state mean, with the exception of math in 2017. NRT results for grades 3-8, in reading, math, science, social studies and language mechanics (where administered) indicate we are below state mean in all subjects and all grades, with the exception of reading and math at the 3rd grade level, and math and Language Mechanics at the 6th grade level. CCR data for the past several years show steady improvement until 14-15, when we saw a slight decrease. CCR rates for the past five years respectively are: 40.8, 57, 65.1, 62.4, and 68.3., and 66.9* (all data corrected during data cleanup does not currently show up on the SRC. 66.9 is the uncorrected 16-17 score. However, since this is what is published, we will include that number as opposed to the 73+ percent the school calculated). The Graduation Rate for the district over the past 4 years is/has been: 96.7, 97.3, 98.1, and 97.7, and 99, exceeding the state average. Nonacademic indicators, attendance, retention, dropout, and transition follow. The attendance rate in Lewis County has ranged from 93.8, 94.0, 93.9, 93.5, 93.9 and 93.7 over the past six years. The retention rate in Lewis County has ranged from 0.4, 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.0, and 1.9 and is below the state retention average. Dropout rates in Lewis County from 11-12 to 16-17 were: .2, .6, .3, .3, .6, and .1 respectively; state dropout rates over the past 5 years have been 1.6, 1.7, 1.7, 1.8, and 1.5, and 1.3%. District and state nonacademic data are notably consistent. Teacher perception/working condition results, as reported by the TELL survey (2017), have improved from the results recorded from the 2011 administration. Our response rates in 2013, 2015 and 2017 were 100%. There were some areas that either stayed the same or fluctuated slightly. Two areas of concern under the facilities section were: 1) the availability of educational technology resources, and 2) reliability and speed of internet connections. Both of these areas improved in 2017. There were also some perceived areas for concern under professional development. Specifically, whether or not teachers have sufficient professional learning to implement technology. Overall ratings indicate that our schools are good places to work and learn fluctuated slightly from 90.3% in 2013 to 89.4 in 2015, and 91.7 in 2017—all three years up from 74.1% in 2011.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Additional Information

Provide any additional information you would like to share with the public and community that were not prompted in the previous sections.

Our work in reducing novice has paid off, almost across the board: all schools and the district made gains. CCR results, graduation rate, and now on-demand writing and language mechanics have been and continue to be areas of relative strength for our district. Strategies that have caused us to be successful to this point will be continued. Our continued weakness, according to the variety of data analyzed, indicates our core programs across subjects and across grade levels have gaps and need to be strengthened. As long as our results indicate that we are below the state mean on any measure, then that is an area of concern. However, some immediate areas of concern to target are reducing the number of students scoring at the novice level, both in the total population and in gap groups, across subjects and grade levels.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

1: Proficiency

Goal 1: Increase the averaged combined reading and math K-Prep scores for elementary, middle, and high school students from 43 to 68; 48.4 to 69.0, and 34 to 67.5 respectively by 2018-19.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: increase the overall averaged combined reading and math scores for elementary, middle, and high school from 40.4 to 55.2; 44.4 to 56.6; and 47.9 to 54.5 percent proficient and distinguished by 05/26/2018 as measured by K-Prep.	KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure regularly-scheduled curriculum meetings to review the alignment between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures. 	Grade, Team, and Dept. meeting minutes and agendas monthly that review curriculum, instructional alignment, ensuring that all students have access to state standards.	Principals will participate and verify alignment checks. Instr. Supervisor and Director of Federal programs will monitor alignment.	N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that vertical curriculum mapping is occurring to identify instructional gaps, including planning for the introduction of the standard, development and gradual release phases, and arrival at standards mastery. 	Grade, Team, and Dept. meeting minutes and agendas monthly that review curriculum, instructional alignment, ensuring that all students have access to state standards.	Principals will participate and verify alignment checks. Instr. Supervisor and Director of Federal programs will monitor alignment.	N/A
	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure monitoring measures are in place to support high fidelity in teaching to the standards, by way of formal and informal observations, classroom data/running records, and standards mastery checks. 	Pacing guides with agreed upon notation system will be available, and monitored monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs	N/A
		Utilize knowledge of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery.	Walkthrough data collection; student assessment data (classroom, diagnostic, state).	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs	N/A
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure curricular alignment reviews are an ongoing action of the PLC's planning process. 	Pacing guides with agreed upon notation system will be available, and monitored monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs	N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery. 	Pacing guides, meeting agendas/minutes will check monthly, and	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director	70,000 ELA consultant

			notify Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE immediately upon discovery of need.	of Federal Programs, DoSE	Online resources to improve practice: 40,000
	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure monitoring measures are in place to support high fidelity in teaching to the standards, by way of peer observations, formal and informal observations, classroom data/running records, and standards mastery checks. 	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a
		Utilize knowledge of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery.	RtI /PLC minutes will be kept to note progress or its lack, no less than monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support	Ensure that effective communication guides instructional planning, student grouping, etc.	RtI /PLC minutes will be kept to note progress or its lack, no less than monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that assessments are designed to best evaluate student learning (i.e. learning target/assessment match). 	Teachers, principal, Instructional supervisor, Director of Fed Programs, will review assessments bi monthly to ensure the validity of local assessments.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a	

2: Gap

Goal 2:
Increase the averaged combined reading and math proficiency ratings for all students in the non-duplicated gap group at all levels (elementary- high) from 28.2 to 64.1; 29.8 to 64.9; and 27.8 to 63.9; AND reduce novice at each level by 50% by 2019.

Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: increase the combined reading and math proficiency for all (in the non-duplicated gap group) at elementary, middle, and high from 36.1 to 46.5%; 32.4 to 49.0%; and 19.2 to 49.4% respectively, AND reduce novice by no less than 10% across the board by 05/31/2018 as measured by K-Prep.	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that formative, interim, summative assessment results, as well as universal screener data, are used appropriately to determine tiered intervention needs. 	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess with formative and summative assessments that are aligned to the standards and learning targets. 	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that all assessments produce accurate evidence. Ensure that assessments are designed to best evaluate student learning (i.e. learning target/assessment match). 	Teachers, principal, Instructional supervisor, Director of Fed Programs, will review assessments bi monthly to ensure the validity of local assessments.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a
Objective 2: identify and provide assistance to all personnel to implement new initiatives aligned to school and district needs by 05/31/2018 as measured by surveys, observation data, and student achievement.	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support	Ensure ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery.	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a

3: Graduation rate

Goal 3: Increase or maintain the graduation rate of 98.0 by 2018-19.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: Increase or maintain the graduation rate of 98.0 by 2018-19.	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data	Create and monitor a “Watch (Cusp) List” for students performing below proficiency.	PTG tool will be checked monthly by hs admin team to ascertain that students on watch list are making progress.	HS principal, assistant principal, guidance counselors	n/a
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enact communication protocols for parents/guardians regarding placement and progress in intervention support systems. 	HS admin will communicate with parents quarterly regarding the progress of his/her student.	HS principal, assistant principal, guidance counselors	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assure that attendance issues are rectified as to not pose an interference with the educational process of students. 	Principals, guidance counselors, DPP will touch base monthly to monitor and document student progress and attendance.	Principals, guidance counselors, DPP	
Objective 2:	KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	Utilize the Persistence to Graduation Tool/Early Warning Tool to assist in identifying students at risk for remediation, failure, and/or untimely graduation.	Quarterly high school administrative and support staff will monitor/check on students identified as at risk.	HS principal, assistant principal(s), guidance counselors.	n/a

4:Growth

Goal 4:

Increase student growth by increasing combined reading and math K-Prep scores for elementary, middle, and high school students from 43 to 68; 48.4 to 69.0, and 34 to 67.5 respectively and by reducing novice performance for all students by by 2018-19.

Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: increase the overall averaged combined reading and math scores for elementary, middle, and high school from 40.4 to 55.2; 44.4 to 56.6; and 47.9 to 54.5 percent proficient and distinguished by 05/26/2018 as measured by K-Prep.	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	Utilize knowledge of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery.	RtI /PLC minutes will be kept to note progress or its lack, no less than monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure monitoring measures are in place to support high fidelity in teaching to the standards, by way of peer observations, formal and informal observations, classroom data/running records, and standards mastery checks. 	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a
	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support	Ensure that effective communication guides instructional planning, student grouping, etc.	RtI /PLC minutes will be kept to note progress or its lack, no less than monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a
Objective 2: Reduce the percentage of novice in the overall averaged combined reading and math scores by 10% at all levels by 5/26/18 as measured by KPREP.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that assessments are designed to best evaluate student learning (i.e. learning target/assessment match). 	Teachers, principal, Instructional supervisor, Director of Fed Programs, will review assessments bi monthly to ensure the validity of local assessments.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a

5: Transition Readiness

Goal 5:

Increase the averaged combined reading and math K-Prep scores for elementary, middle, and high school students from 36 to 68; 38 to 69.0, and 35 to 67.5 respectively by 2018-19 AND reducing percent of novice of all students to no more than 25% in any content area by 2020.

Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: increase the overall averaged combined reading and math scores for elementary, middle, and high school from 40.4 to 55.2; 44.4 to 56.6; and 47.9 to 54.5 percent proficient and distinguished by 05/26/2018 as measured by K-Prep.	KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure monitoring measures are in place to support high fidelity in teaching to the standards, by way of peer observations, formal and informal observations, classroom data/running records, and standards mastery checks. 	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a
		Utilize knowledge of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery.	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a
Objective 2: Reduce the percentage of novice in the overall averaged combined reading and math scores by 10% at all levels by 5/26/18 as measured by KPREP.	KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support	Ensure ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery.	Principal monitoring sheets and observation data will be utilized to ensure that students receive the aligned and assigned instruction. Monitoring sheets will be completed monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE, Superintendent	n/a
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that assessments are designed to best evaluate student learning (i.e. learning target/assessment match). 	Teachers, principal, Instructional supervisor, Director of Fed Programs, will review assessments bi monthly to ensure the validity of local assessments.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use assessment evidence to certify student competency or program effectiveness. 	RtI /PLC minutes will be kept to note progress or its lack, no less than monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a
	KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use summative evidence to inform what comes next for individual students and groups of students. 	RtI /PLC minutes will be kept to note progress or its lack, no less than monthly.	Principals, Instructional Supervisor, Director of Federal Programs, DoSE,	n/a