

**2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for
Schools_09232019_09:32**

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 09/23/2019

Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools 3

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

The **Comprehensive School Improvement Plan or CSIP** is defined as a *plan developed by the school council, or successor, and charter schools with the input of parents, faculty, and staff, based on a review of relevant data that includes targets, strategies, activities, and a time schedule to support student achievement and student growth, and to eliminate gaps among groups of students.*

The comprehensive school and district improvement plan process is outlined in 703 KAR 5:225. The requirements included in the administrative regulation are key components of the continuous improvement process in Kentucky and ultimately fulfillment of school, district, and state goals under the Kentucky State Plan as required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

While the regulation outlines a timeline for compliance purposes, the plan itself is a strategic and proven approach to improve processes and to ensure students achieve. The timeline for the school's 2019-20 diagnostics is as follows:

Phase One: August 1 - October 1

- Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

Phase Two: October 1 - November 1

- The Needs Assessment for Schools
- School Assurances
- School Safety Report

Phase Three: November 1 - January 1

- Comprehensive School Improvement Plan
- Executive Summary for Schools
- Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic for Schools
- Title I Annual Review* Diagnostic

Phase Four: January 1 - December 31

- Progress Monitoring

As principal of the school, I hereby commit to implementing continuous improvement processes with fidelity to support student achievement and student growth and to eliminate achievement gaps among groups of students.

Please enter your name and date below to certify.

Michelle Cobb 9/23/2019

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10042019_14:32

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/22/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	4
Protocol	5
Current State	6
Priorities/Concerns	7
Trends	8
Potential Source of Problem.....	9
Strengths/Leverages	10
Attachment Summary	11

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

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 (e.g. 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 (i.e. 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. 703 KAR 2:225 requires, as part of continuous improvement planning for schools, each school complete the needs assessment between October 1 and November 1 of each year and include: (1) a description of the data reviewed and the process used to develop the needs assessment; (2) a review of the previous plan and its implementation to inform development of the new plan; and, (3) perception data gathered from the administration of a valid and reliable measure of teaching and learning conditions. Further, as required by Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools implementing a schoolwide program must base their Title I program on a comprehensive needs assessment.

Protocol

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

KPREP, MAP, Brigance, RTI & RTA Data, and Common Assessment data results are reviewed on a consistent basis. Data review takes place with the Admin Team during weekly admin meetings as well as during District Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Meetings. The data is also shared with the entire faculty, grade specific teachers through PLC's, and with the SBDM council on a regular basis. In addition, specific student data is analyzed during weekly PLC grade level meetings and Special Education PLC's as well as MTSS meetings which occur every 4-6 weeks and include school admin team, primary and intermediate interventionists, school counselor, school psychologist and lead special education teacher.

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:

- Thirty-four (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (54%) of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 57%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

-- 67.6% of all students reached proficiency on the 2018-2019 Reading KPREP Assessment which was an increase from 61.5% in 2017-2018. This was above the district average of 63.2% and state average of 54.6%.-- 68.09% of 3rd Grade students fell in the proficient or distinguished range on the 2018-2019 Reading KPREP Assessment which was an increase of 10% from the 2017-2018 Reading KPREP Assessment. -- 58.9% of all students reached proficiency on the 2018-2019 Math KPREP Assessment which was below the district average of 60.2% but above the state average of 48.6%.--63.2% of all students reached proficiency in on the On Demand KPREP Assessment. This was above the district average of 59.8% and significantly above the state average of 46.6%.--64.2% of students met proficiency in Social Studies on the 2018-2019 KPREP Assessment which was below our district average of 67.8%, but above the state average of 53%.-- 37.5% of all students scored proficient or distinguished on the 2018-2019 Science KPREP which was below the district average of 40.2%, but above the state average of 31.7%-- 44.7% of the students at Ryland Heights Elementary are economically disadvantaged. -- Ryland Heights Elementary had an attendance rate of 95.8% for the 2018-2019 school year.

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

Example: Sixty-eight (68%) of students in the achievement gap scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

--Only 31.7% of students reached proficiency on the 2018-2019 Science KPREP Assessment-- While 81.2% of non-economically disadvantaged students met proficiency in reading on the 2018-2019 KPREP Assessment, only 51.3% of economically disadvantaged students achieved proficiency on that assessment. --Similarly, while 71% of non-economically disadvantaged students met proficiency in math on the 2018-2019 KPREP Assessment, only 44.3% of economically disadvantaged students achieved proficiency on that assessment-- While 3rd grade math proficiency increased from 40% in 2016-2017, to 59.4% in 2017-2018, there was a decline to 54.25% math proficiency in 2018-2019 with regards to the 3rd Grade KPREP math assessment data. This continues to be an area of concern with 14.89% of 3rd grade students falling in the Novice range and 30.85% of 3rd Grade students falling in the apprentice range on the most recent, 2018-2019, Math KPREP Assessment.-- Students with disabilities continues to be an area of concern with only 23.1% of 3rd grade students reaching proficiency on the 2018-2019 KPREP Math Assessment, in contrast to 54.25% of all 3rd grade students. 5th Grade students with disabilities had 29.2% reach proficiency on the 2018-2019 KPREP Reading assessment which was 30.8% lower than the average proficiency of all 5th grade students which fell at 60%.

Trends

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

--While Science was not assessed in the 2016-2017 school year, Science remains an area of concern. While we increased science proficiency by 9.9% in the 2018-2019 KPREP Assessment, our score continued to fall at only 37.5% proficient which was an increase from the 2017-2018 proficiency score of 27.6%.-- There continues to be an upward trend in Reading proficiency on the KPREP Reading assessment. Overall reading proficiency fell at 60% in 2016-2017, increased to 61.51% in 2017-2018, and continued to increase with an overall reading proficiency of 67.6% in 2018-2019. However, there continues to be a gap with regards to non-economically disadvantaged students in comparison with economically disadvantaged students in this area. 81.2% of non-economically disadvantaged students met proficiency in reading while only 51.3% of economically disadvantaged students met proficiency in reading on the 2018-2019 KPREP Assessment. Data indicates that the percentage of non-economically disadvantaged students meeting proficiency in reading increased by 9.5% between 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, while reading proficiency of economically disadvantaged students stayed relatively stagnant with a increase of only 0.2%. -- Similarly, there has been an upward trend with overall proficiency in mathematics with 50.5% of all students reaching math proficiency in 2016-2017, increasing to 55.3% in 2017-2018 and increasing yet again in 2018-2019 with 58.9% proficiency. While math proficiency for non-economically disadvantaged students was at 71% on the 2018-2019 KPREP Assessment, which was an increase of 6.5% from 2017-2018, only 44.3% of economically disadvantaged students achieved proficiency on that assessment which was a decrease in proficiency of 1.7% for that population of students.

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 Key Core Work Processes outlined below:

[KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards](#)

[KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction](#)

[KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy](#)

[KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data](#)

[KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)

[KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment](#)

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction -- We will continue to work to refine instructional strategies including student engagement, formative assessment, and requiring a product from all students to strengthen the Tier 1 instruction. KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data -- We will continue to review and revise our strategies to utilize data to determine areas of student strengths and growth areas as well as areas of instructional focus within content areas. KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support -- In addition, we will continue to focus on ensuring that all student needs are met through the utilization of our Multi Tiered System of Support which focuses on student needs. This is a systematic way to focus on student needs, determine supports needed and monitor student progress to determine needs.

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school.

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

-- The percentage of fourth grade students who reached proficiency on the 2019 Reading KPREP Assessment was 78.12% which was an increase of 20.02% from the 3rd grade proficiency on the 2018 Reading KPREP Assessment for this same group of students. 80.65% of the 2018-2019, 4th grade students achieved growth in Reading on the KPREP Assessment. In addition, the percentage of 3rd grade students who scored novice on the 2017-2018 KPREP Reading Assessment decreased from 18.9% to 4.69% for this same group of students as fourth grade students participating in the 2018-2019 KPREP Reading Assessment. -- 60% of the 5th grade students assessed on the 2018-2019 KPREP Reading Assessment achieved proficiency which was an increase from 52% with regards to this same group of students as 4th grade students on the 2017-2018 KPREP Assessment.-- The percentage of students performing in the novice range for this group of students decreased from 22.4% as fourth grade students on the 2017-2018 Reading KPREP Assessment to 14.74% as fifth grade students on the 2018-2019 KPREP Reading Assessment. In addition, 83.7 percent of fifth grade students made growth in reading based upon KPREP Assessment scores. -- The percentage of students in 4th grade who reached proficiency on the 2018-2019 KPREP Math Assessment fell at 75% which was a 15.6% increase for this same group of students who had 59.4% proficiency as 3rd grade students on the 2017-2018 KPREP Assessment.-- Novice performance decreased from the 3rd grade percentage of 12.2% on the 2017-2018 KPREP Math assessment to 4.69% with this same group of students as fourth grade students participating in the 2018-2019 Math KPREP Assessment. In addition, 88.71% of fourth grade students made growth on the 2018-2019 KPREP Math Assessment.-- 52.63% of 5th Grade students reached proficiency on the 2018-2019 KPREP Math Assessment which was an increase from 43.8% for this same group of students as 4th grade students assessed on the 2017-2018 KPREP Assessment.--The percentage of 5th grade students performing in the novice range was 4.21% which was a decrease of 23.39% from the previous year where 27.6% of this same group of students performed at the novice level on the 4th grade KPREP Math Assessment.-- While there are some areas of concern with regards to the achievement of students with disabilities, one area of strength was that 69.2% of 3rd Grade students with disabilities achieved proficiency on the 2018-2019 KPREP Reading Assessment which exceeded the percentage of all 3rd grade students achieving proficiency which fell at 58.1%.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances_10102019_13:59

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/10/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances	3
Introduction.....	4
Teacher Performance	5
Title I Schoolwide Programs.....	6
Title I Targeted Assistance School Programs	8
Schools Identified for Targeted Support and Improvement	10
All School Programs.....	11
Attachment Summary.....	12

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances

2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances

Introduction

Assurances are a required component of the CSIP process (703 KAR 5:225). Please read each assurance and indicate whether your school is in compliance by selecting the appropriate response (Yes, No or N/A). If you wish to provide further information or clarify your response, space for comments is provided. Comments are optional. You may upload any supporting documentation as needed.

Teacher Performance

1. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires each school to report data regarding ineffective teachers. An ineffective teacher receives a summative effectiveness rate of “Ineffective” as determined through the local performance evaluation system that meets the requirements established by KRS 157.557. An ineffective teacher consistently fails to meet expectations as determined by a trained evaluator, in competencies identified as the performance criteria in the Kentucky Framework for Teaching.

Responses to this assurance will be collected in the [Kentucky Teacher Performance survey](#). Responses to each survey question should be based on data from the 2018-19 school year. Once you have completed the survey, return to the 2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances diagnostic to certify that your school has completed the survey and to complete the remaining assurances on the diagnostic.

I certify this school has completed the Kentucky Teacher Performance survey.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

Title I Schoolwide Programs

2. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan during a 1-year period or qualifies for an exception under Section 1114(b)(1) of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

3. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served as well as individuals who will carry out such plan (e.g. teachers, administrators, classified staff, etc.) as required by Section 1114(b)(2) of ESSA.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

4. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that will remain in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Title I, Part A of ESSA as required by Section 1114(b)(3) of ESSA.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

5. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that is available to district leadership, parents, and the public and in an understandable and uniform format as required by Section 1114(b)(4) of ESSA.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

6. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that, to the extent appropriate and applicable, coordinates with other federal, state, and local programs, including but not limited to the implementation of improvement activities in schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, as required by Section 1114(b)(5) of ESSA.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

7. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed a comprehensive plan that is based on a comprehensive needs assessment, which included a review of academic achievement data, and includes, among other items, a description of the strategies the school will implement to address school needs as required by Section 1114(b)(6) of ESSA.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

8. If the school is implementing a schoolwide program, the school developed, pursuant to Section 1114(b)(7), a comprehensive plan that includes a description of the strategies to be implemented to address school needs, including how such strategies: (1) provide opportunities for all children; (2) use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen the academic program in the school, increase learning time, and provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum; and, (3) address the needs of all children through, for example, the following activities: school-based mental health programs; a tiered model to prevent and address behavioral problems; professional development to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers; and/or, strategies for assisting preschool children transition to local elementary school programs.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

Title I Targeted Assistance School Programs

9. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, participating students are identified in accordance with Section 1115(c) and on the basis of multiple, educationally related, objective criteria.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

10. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students using resources under Title I, Part of ESSA to meet challenging state academic standards as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(A) of ESSA.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

11. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves, pursuant to Section 1115(b)(2)(B) of ESSA, participating students using methods and instructional strategies to strengthen the academic program of the school, which may include, for example, expanded learning time, summer programs, and/or a tiered model to prevent and address behavioral problems.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

12. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students by coordinating with and supporting the regular educational program as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(C) of ESSA.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

13. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students by providing professional development to, for example, teachers, administrators, classified staff, and/or other school personnel who work with participating students as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(D) of ESSA.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

14. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves, pursuant to Section 1115(b)(2)(E) of ESSA, participating students by implementing strategies to increase the involvement of parents of participating students in accordance with Section 1116 of ESSA.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

15. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students, to the extent appropriate and applicable, by coordinating with other federal, state, and local programs, including but not limited to the implementation of improvement activities in schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(F) of ESSA.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

16. If the school is implementing a targeted assistance school program, the school serves participating students by reviewing the progress of participating students on an ongoing basis and revising the targeted assistance program, if necessary, to provide additional assistance to meet challenging state academic standards as required by Section 1115(b)(2)(G) of ESSA.

- Yes
- No
- N/A**

Schools Identified for Targeted Support and Improvement

17. If identified for targeted support and improvement pursuant to Section 1111(d)(2) of ESSA, the school developed and implemented a plan to improve student outcomes that, among other items, was informed by all indicators, including student performance against long-term goals; included evidence-based interventions; and, approved by local leadership. For reference, “evidence-based” is defined in ESSA Section 8101(21).

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

All School Programs

18. The school provides professional development for staff that is in accordance with the purpose of Title II of ESSA; addresses the needs of all students; and, strives to ensure all students are college, career and transition ready as intended by Section 2103 of ESSA, which governs the local use of Title II funding.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

19. The school collects and publicly disseminates, in compliance with Kentucky's Consolidated State Plan and in alignment with Section 1111(g)(1)(B), data through the School Report Card that addresses students' access to effective/experienced teachers.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

20. The school ensures that, if the Title I application includes funding for certified or classified positions (e.g. counselors, nurses, media specialists, etc.), there is documentation indicating such is needed to improve student achievement. This ensures the use is reasonable and necessary in compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), including 2 CFR 200.403 and 200.405.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

21. The school ensures that all teachers and paraprofessionals working in a program supported with Title I, Part A funding meet applicable state certification and licensure requirements as required by Section 1111(g)(2)(J) of ESSA.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

22. The school distributes to parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy, agreed on by such parents, that complies with Section 1116(c)-(f) of ESSA and is in an understandable and uniform format as required by Section 1116(b) of ESSA. For reference, Section 1116(b) of ESSA allows existing parent and family engagement policies the school may have in place to be amended to meet the requirements under Title I, Part A.

- Yes**
- No
- N/A

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------

2019-20 Phase Two: School Safety Report_10102019_13:48

2019-20 Phase Two: School Safety Report

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/18/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: School Safety Report	3
School Safety Diagnostic for Schools	4
Questions Related to the Adoption and Implementation of the Emergency Plan.....	5
Attachment Summary.....	7

2019-20 Phase Two: School Safety Report

2019-20 Phase Two: School Safety Report

School Safety Diagnostic for Schools

Pursuant to KRS 158.162, the local board of education shall require the school council or, if none exists, the principal in each school to adopt an emergency plan that must be utilized in case of fire, severe weather, earthquake, or a building lockdown and that: establishes evacuation routes; identifies the best available severe weather zones; develops earthquake protocols for students; and, develops and adheres to practices controlling access to the school building. The emergency plan shall be annually reviewed by the council, principal, and first responders and revised as needed.

In addition to the emergency plan requirements in KRS 158.162, KRS 158.164 requires the local board of education to direct the school council or, if none exists, the principal in each school to establish procedures to perform a building lockdown and to invite local law enforcement to assist in establishing lockdown procedures.

KRS 158.162 also requires the emergency plan be discussed with all school staff prior to the first instructional day of the school year and provided, along with a diagram of the facility, to appropriate first responders. Further, the principal in each school shall conduct, at a minimum, the following emergency response drills within the first 30 instructional days of the school year and again during the month of January: one severe weather drill, one earthquake drill, and one lockdown drill. In addition, required fire drills shall be conducted according to administrative regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing, Buildings and Construction.

Questions Related to the Adoption and Implementation of the Emergency Plan

1. Has the school council or, where applicable, principal adopted an emergency plan in accordance with local board policy and in compliance with the specifications in KRS 158.162(3)?

If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box. Please note that Senate Bill 1 (2019) amended KRS 158.162(3)(d) to require, for example, classroom doors remain closed and locked during instructional time as well as classroom doors with windows be equipped with material to quickly cover the window during a building lockdown. Schools are encouraged to comply with these changes as soon as practicable but, if needed, have until July 1, 2022 to fully implement. Accordingly, failure to comply with KRS 158.162(3)(d), as amended, should not be reported herein until the 2022-2023 school year and beyond.

Yes.

2. Has the school provided local first responders with a copy of the school's emergency plan along with a diagram of the school as required by KRS 158.162(2)(b)?

If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box.

Yes.

3. Has the school posted primary and secondary evacuation routes in each room by any doorway used for evacuation as required by KRS 158.162(3)(a)?

If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box.

Yes.

4. Has the school posted the location of severe weather safe zones in each room as required by KRS 158.162(3)(b)?

If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box.

Yes.

5. Was the school's emergency plan reviewed following the end of the prior school year by the school council, principal, and first responders and revised as needed as required by KRS 158.162(2)(c)?

Please provide the most recent date of review/revision of the school's emergency plan in the district in the comment box. If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box.

While it was not reviewed following the end of the prior school year and before the beginning of the current year, it was reviewed in closed session with council on October 24, 2019.

6. Did the principal discuss the emergency plan with **all** school staff prior to the first instructional day of the current school year and appropriately document the time and date of such discussion as required by KRS 158.162(2)(d)?

Please provide the date the school completed this discussion in the comment box. If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box.

Yes. It was reviewed on August 19, 2019 with all staff during opening day.

7. During the first 30 instructional days of the current school year, did the principal conduct at least one severe weather drill, one earthquake drill, and one lockdown drill as required by KRS 158.162(5)?

If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box.

Yes.

8. During the month of January during the prior school year, did the principal conduct at least one severe weather drill, one earthquake drill, and one lockdown drill as required by KRS 158.162(5)?

If the answer is "no", please explain in the comment box.

Yes.

9. Over the immediately preceding twelve months, did each school within the district conduct fire drills in accordance with administrative regulations promulgated by the Department of Housing, Buildings and Construction as required by KRS 158.162(5)?

If all schools in the district did NOT meet the requirement, respond "no" and please explain further in the comment box.

Yes, at Ryland Heights Elementary we conducted fire drills in accordance with regulations.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools_11132019_08:38

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/13/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools.....	3
Attachment Summary.....	5

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools

2019-20 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools

Description of the School

Describe the school's 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 school serves?

The Kenton County School District includes eleven elementary schools and has a population of over 14,500 students. Ryland Heights Elementary is one of the southernmost elementary schools in the district. Ryland Heights Elementary serves a diverse population of students from unincorporated areas of a rural community and extends to the cities of Covington, Taylor Mill, Fairview, Independence, Visalia and Morning View. With students from several different communities, we have a variety of barriers that our students and families face. Our building was built in 1960 and was renovated in 1994 to add a gym and a media center. It was again renovated in 2005 to add four technology smart classrooms.

School's Purpose

Provide the school's purpose statement and ancillary content such as mission, vision, values, and/or beliefs. Describe how the school embodies its purpose through its program offerings and expectations for students.

The mission of Ryland Heights Elementary School is to provide a strong foundation of academic, behavioral and social skills that will ensure students are prepared for a successful transition to middle school. We believe that all students can learn and grow daily, and we strive to have high expectations and provide rigorous learning opportunities for all students. We also believe that all students are unique and learn differently; therefore, we provide a variety of opportunities for needs based instruction and interventions to meet students where they are and help them learn and grow. In order to help students achieve their fullest potential, we believe that a partnership among parents & guardians, educators, students, and the community is key.

Notable Achievements and Areas of Improvement

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

Ryland's students showed significant growth on the 2018-2019 KPREP Reading and Math assessments. Ryland's Growth Scores ranked eighth in the state which was in the top 1%. While there is still room for growth to reach proficiency, 80.65% of 4th Grade students and 83.7% of 5th Grade students made growth on the 2018-2019 KPREP Reading Assessment. Similarly, 88.71% of 4th Grade students and 91.3% of 5th Grade students made growth on the 2018-2019 KPREP Math Assessment. On the 2018-2019 KPREP assessments, Ryland Heights Elementary scored above the state average in all areas. In addition, our 4th grade reading and math scores ranked in the top 5% of the state, Ryland's overall proficiency ranked in the top 20% of the state, and we achieved in the top 25% of the state for Separate Academic Indicator. While the combined reading and math KPREP proficiency for students with disabilities increased 14.4% from 23.1% in 2018 to 37.5% in 2019, there is still much room for improvement with regards to our students with disabilities. We will continue to focus on meeting the needs of our students with disabilities as well as our economically disadvantaged students.

Additional Information

CSI/TSI Schools Only: Describe the procedures used to create the school's improvement plan and briefly state the specific efforts to address the causes of low student performance and resource inequities.

N/A

Additional Information

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

At Ryland Heights Elementary School, we know that the key to student success is holding high expectations for all students and providing them with a rigorous and engaging learning opportunity each and every day. Creating a love for learning within students and pushing them to reach their fullest potential will enable us to prepare students for the transition to middle school and all opportunities that come their way throughout their educational career and beyond.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools_11132019_08:38

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/02/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools	3
Attachment Summary	5

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools

2019-20 Phase Three: Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Schools

Rationale

School improvement efforts are a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. Through the improvement planning process, leaders focus on priority needs, funding, and closing achievement gaps between identified subgroups of students. When implemented with fidelity, the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) cultivates an environment that promotes student growth and achievement.

Operational Definitions

Goal: Long-term three to five year targets based on the five (5) required school level goals. Elementary/middle schools must have goals for proficiency, separate academic indicator, gap, growth, and transition readiness. High schools must have goals for proficiency, separate academic indicator, gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness. Long-term targets should be informed by The Needs Assessment for Schools.

Objective: Short-term target to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal.

Strategy: An approach to systematically address the process, practice, or condition that the school will focus its efforts upon in order to reach its goals or objectives. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six (6) Key Core Work Processes listed below or another established improvement approach (i.e. *Six Sigma*, *Shipleigh*, *Baldrige*, etc.).

Activity: Actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.

Key Core Work Processes: A series of processes identified by the Kentucky Department of Education that involve the majority of an organization's workforce and relate to its core competencies. These are the factors that determine an organization's success and help it prioritize areas for growth.

[KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards](#)

[KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction](#)

[KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy](#)

[KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data](#)

[KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)

[KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment](#)

Measure of Success: Criteria that shows the impact of the work. The **measures** may be quantitative or qualitative, but are observable in some way.

Progress Monitoring: Process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Should include timelines and responsible individuals.

Funding: Local, state, or federal funds/grants used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative.

Requirements for Building an Improvement Plan

There are six (6) required district goals:

- Proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap closure, graduation rate, growth, and transition readiness.

The required school goals include the following:

- For elementary/middle school, these include: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and, growth.
- For high school, these include: proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness.

Using the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan Template

- a. Develop your Strategic Goals using the [Comprehensive School Improvement Plan Template](#).
- b. **Upload** your completed Comprehensive School Improvement Plan in the attachment area below.

You may enter an optional narrative about your Comprehensive School Improvement Plan below. If you do not have an optional narrative, enter N/A.

N/A

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 Goal Builder	Goal Builder	•

2019-20 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic _11132019_08:39

2019-20 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/02/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic	3
I. Achievement Gap Group Identification.....	4
II. Achievement Gap Analysis	5
III. Planning the Work.....	7
Attachment Summary	8

2019-20 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic

2019-20 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic

Rationale

The **Closing the Achievement Gap Report** is required by KRS 158.649, which requires the school-based decision making council, or the principal if no council exists to set the school's targets for eliminating any achievement gap. The targets should be established with input from parents, faculty, and staff and submitted to the superintendent for consideration and the local board of education for adoption.

In addition to being a legal mandate, the Closing the Achievement Gap Report is also a vital component of the continuous improvement process. The report is designed to underscore a school's trend data (i.e. two-year window) relating to its individual gap groups. Upon completion of the **Closing the Achievement Gap Report**, schools will have already engaged in a significant piece of school improvement work by intentionally focusing on the gaps that exist among its underserved student populations.

I. Achievement Gap Group Identification

Schools should use a variety of measures and analysis to conduct its annual Closing the Achievement Gap Report pursuant to KRS 158.649.

Complete the [Achievement Gap Group spreadsheet](#) and attach it.

See attachment.

II. Achievement Gap Analysis

A. Describe the school's climate and culture as they relate to its achievement gap population.

Ryland Elementary staff work to ensure that all students are learning and growing at their highest potential regardless of race, ethnicity, disability and SES.

B. Which achievement gaps has the school successfully **closed**? Use specific data from the previous two academic years when analyzing trends.

The main gap student groups for Ryland Heights Elementary are Economically Disadvantaged as well as Students with Disabilities. Our Economically Disadvantaged students had 51.1% reach reading proficiency on the 2018 KPREP Reading Assessment. That percentage stayed relatively consistent with 51.3% of Economically Disadvantaged students reaching reading proficiency on the 2019 KPREP Reading Assessment. 46% of Economically Disadvantaged students reached math proficiency on the 2018 KPREP Math Assessment and that number showed a slight decline with only 44.3% of Economically Disadvantaged students reaching math proficiency on the 2019 KPREP Math Assessment. Our Students with Disabilities continues to be a significant area of concern. The combined reading and math KPREP proficiency for students with disabilities increased 14.4%, from 23.1% in 2018 to 37.5% in 2019, but there is still much room for improvement with regards to our students with disabilities. We will continue to focus on meeting the needs of our students with disabilities.

C. Based upon the analysis of the school's achievement gap data, identify the gap groups and content areas where the school has **shown improvement**. Use specific data from the previous two academic years when analyzing trends.

Students with Disabilities is one of the main student gap groups at Ryland Heights Elementary. While the combined reading and math KPREP proficiency for students with disabilities increased 14.4% from 23.1% in 2018 to 37.5% in 2019, there is still much room for improvement with regards to our students with disabilities. Only 23.1% of 3rd Grade students with disabilities scored proficient or distinguished on the 2019 KPREP Math Assessment in contrast to 54.25% of all 3rd grade students. Similarly, on 20.8% of 5th grade students with disabilities scored proficient or distinguished on the 2019 KPREP Social Studies assessment while 64.2% of all 5th grade students scored proficient or distinguished. We will continue to focus on meeting the needs of our students with disabilities.

D. Based upon the analysis of the gap data, identify the gap groups and content areas where the school has **lacked progression or regressed**. Use specific data from the previous two academic years when analyzing trends.

Our Economically Disadvantaged students had 51.1% reach reading proficiency on the 2018 KPREP Reading Assessment. That percentage stayed relatively consistent with 51.3% of Economically Disadvantaged students reaching reading proficiency on the 2019 KPREP Reading Assessment. 46% of Economically Disadvantaged students reached math proficiency on the 2018 KPREP Math Assessment and that number showed a slight decline with only 44.3% of Economically Disadvantaged students reaching math proficiency on the 2019 KPREP Math Assessment.

E. Describe the processes, practices and/or conditions that have prevented the school from closing existing and persistent achievement gaps.

We continue to implement professional development opportunities to increase teachers utilization of effective instructional strategies and strengthen Tier 1 instruction. In addition, we are refining the process to recognize individual student needs, determine student progress on interventions and define next steps through our Multi Tiered System of Support.

F. Describe the process used to involve teachers, leaders, and other stakeholders in the continuous improvement and planning process as it relates to closing the achievement gap. List the names and roles of strategic partners involved.

Assessment data is reviewed with teachers regularly by school administration during weekly PLC's. There is an intentional process for weekly review of student progress on achieving IEP goals and objectives as well as mastering grade level standards for all students with disabilities during weekly grade level and special education PLC's. School achievement data regarding all students in comparison to gap group performance is shared regularly with the SBDM Council.

G. Describe in detail the school's professional development plan related to its achievement gaps.

(Note: School-based decision making councils, or principals in schools where no council exists, are required by KRS 158.649(8) to submit revisions to the school improvement plan describing the use of professional development funds to reduce achievement gaps for review and approval by the superintendent. Superintendents shall report, pursuant to KRS 158.649(9), to the local school board and Commissioner of Education schools failing to meet targets to reduce the gap in student achievement for any student group two years in a row, and improvement plans for those schools will be subject to review and approval by KDE.)

Professional development will include ongoing training on the Cycle of Quality Instruction and scaffolding instruction to ensure that all students are mastering the standards. Teachers will continue to receive training on effective engagement strategies and how to create and implement tasks that have a high cognitive demand and require all students to produce a product. Training revolving around effective co-teaching will continue throughout the year, with selected teachers participating in the District Co-teaching Cohort. These teachers will return to the building as teacher leaders in this area and share out with teachers and school staff on the most effective co-teaching strategies.

III. Planning the Work

Closing the Achievement Gap Goals

List all measurable goals for each identified gap population and content area for the current school year. This percentage should be based on trend data identified in Section II and based on data such as universal screeners, classroom data, ACT, and Response to Intervention (RTI). Content areas should never be combined into a single goal (i.e., Combined reading and math should always be separated into two goals – one for reading and one for math – in order to explicitly focus on strategies and activities tailored to the goal).

The closing the achievement gap goal is to increase the combined reading and math KPREP proficiency scores for students with disabilities from 43% in 2019 to 61.55% in 2023 as measured by school report card proficiency data. Objective 1 for this goal is to increase the combined reading and math KPREP proficiency for students with disabilities from 43% in 2019 to 47.7% in 2020.

Closing the Achievement Gap

Step 1: Download the [Closing the Achievement Gap Summary](#) spreadsheet.

Step 2: Complete your findings and answers.

Step 3: Upload the Completed Closing the Achievement Gap Plan Summary spreadsheet.

See attached.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 Achievement Gap Group Identification	Achievement Gap Group Identification	•
 Closing the Achievement Gap Summary	Closing the Achievement Gap Summary	•

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic_11132019_08:39

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic

Ryland Heights Elementary School

Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/04/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic	3
Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Schoolwide Plan	5
Evaluation of the Schoolwide Program	6
Parent and Family Engagement (ESSA Section 1116).....	7
Attachment Summary	8

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic

2019-20 Phase Three: Title I Annual Review Diagnostic

Schools with a Title I schoolwide program must conduct a yearly evaluation of the program as required under [34 CFR §200.26](#) and ESSA Section 1114(b)(3). Please respond to each of the following questions about the annual evaluation of your school's schoolwide program. For more information about schoolwide program requirements, consult the [Title I Handbook](#) and 34 CFR §200.26. Documentation is not required and, therefore, is optional.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Rationale: A school operating a schoolwide program must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment in accordance with ESSA Section 1114(b). Through the needs assessment, a school must consult with a broad range of stakeholders and examine relevant data to understand students' needs and their root causes.

1. Describe the effectiveness of your needs assessment process.

KPREP, MAP and Brigance data were used to conduct the Needs Assessment. Data is shared on a regular basis with all stakeholders through SBDM Council Meetings, Parent Engagement Activities, grade level PLC's, faculty meetings and school wide data analysis. While Ryland Heights Elementary is making growth, there continues to be room for growth in both reading and math with 32.4% of all 3rd -5th grade students falling below proficiency in the area of reading on the 2019 KPREP Reading Assessment and 41.1% of all 3rd -5th grade students falling below proficiency in the area of math as assessed on the 2019 KPREP assessment. The data also shows the performance level of our students with disabilities population continues to be an area of concern. Through data analysis, a continued focus on quality instruction practices as well as increased professional development on effective co-teaching was determined to be areas of need.

Schoolwide Plan

Rationale: The schoolwide program must incorporate strategies to improve academic achievement throughout the school, but particularly for the lowest-achieving students, by addressing the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment. ESSA Section 1114(b)(7). The schoolwide plan must include a description of how the strategies the school will be implementing will provide opportunities and address the learning needs of all students in the school, particularly the needs of the lowest-achieving students. The plan must explain how the methods and instructional strategies that the school intends to use will strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, including programs and activities necessary to provide a well-rounded education. ESSA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii).

2. Describe the effectiveness of the strategies that were implemented as part of the schoolwide program in meeting the requirements above. Please cite the data sources used in the evaluation of the strategies.

The schoolwide plan was implemented as written. CSIP goals that addressed areas of concern include focus on reading instruction - implementation of the iRead program and focus on math - implementation of the STMath program. Title Funds purchased the iRead program and assisted in the funding of an interventionist at the intermediate level to assist with both reading and math. While there is still need for intervention and student growth to continue toward proficiency, the current program has proved to be effective. When analyzing MAP data to determine student growth for all students grades K-5, 69.54% of all students met growth on the MAP Reading assessment from fall of 2018 to spring of 2019, and 69.13% of all students met growth on the MAP math assessment from fall 2018 to spring of 2019. Using the KPREP assessment data to determine growth for 4th and 5th grade students, 80.65% of 4th Grade students made growth in reading and 83.7% of 4th grade students made growth in math; 88.71% of 5th grade students made growth in reading and 91.3% of 5th grade students made growth in math. Overall, Ryland Heights Elementary ranked in the top 1% of the state of Kentucky with regards to growth on the 2019 KPREP Assessment and achieved an overall rating of a 4 star school.

3. Describe the method used to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies to improve academic achievement throughout the school, but particularly for the lowest achieving students.

Student performance and growth was assessed using MAP and KPREP Assessment data. The K-2 students placed in our reading intervention program showed great gains. When using the MAP Reading Assessment from Fall 2018-Spring 2019, 85% of 2nd grade students placed in reading interventions made growth, 78% of 1st grade students placed in reading interventions made growth and 85% of Kindergarten students placed in reading interventions made growth. When analyzing MAP data to review progress of students with disabilities across grades K-5, 57.75% of Students with Disabilities made growth on the MAP Reading Assessment from Fall 2018 to Spring 2019, and 71.01% of students with disabilities made growth on the MAP Math Assessment from Fall 2018 to Spring 2019. Using the 2019 KPREP assessment data to determine growth for 4th and 5th grade students with disabilities, 90% of 4th and 5th grade students with disabilities made growth on the KPREP Math assessments. In addition, 69.2% of 3rd grade students with disabilities scored proficient or distinguished on the 2019 KPREP Reading Assessment.

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Program

Rationale:

Schools with Title I schoolwide programs are required to annually evaluate the schoolwide plan, using data from state assessments, other student performance data, and perception data to determine if the schoolwide program has been effective in addressing the major problem areas and, in turn, increasing student achievement, particularly for the lowest-achieving students. Schools must annually revise the plan, as necessary, based on student needs and the results of the evaluation to ensure continuous improvement. ESSA Section 1114(b)(3); 34 C.F.R. § 200.26(c).

4. What revisions will be made to next year's schoolwide plan based on the results of the evaluation?

While there has been much growth and an increase in proficiency for the students at Ryland Heights Elementary, we will continue many of the things that were in place previously as a part of our Title 1 program. Students in grades K-2 will continue to use the iRead program and once again, title funds have helped to fund an intermediate interventionist to assist with both reading and math. For the 2019-2020 school year, Title 1 funds will be used to assist in the implementation of a primary math interventionist that works with students in grades K-2.

Parent and Family Engagement (ESSA Section 1116)

Rationale:

Each school receiving Title I, Part A funds is required to conduct parent and family involvement activities as specified in ESSA Section 1116 (c)(1)-(5). Title I, Part A requires schools to develop jointly with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy. In addition, as a component of the school-level parent and family engagement policy, each school shall jointly develop with parents for all children served a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high academic standards. ESSA Section 1116(d).

Districts must build the capacity for involvement of parents and family members as described in ESSA Section 1116(e). To the extent practicable, districts must provide opportunities for the informed participation of parents and family members, including parents and family members who have limited English proficiency, parents and family members with disabilities, and parents and family members of migratory children, as described in ESSA Section 1116(f).

5. Describe the effectiveness of your school's parent and family engagement program and the processes and data sources used to make this determination.

The Title 1 Parent Survey is an opportunity for parents to share their input regarding the school wide program at Ryland Heights Elementary. In addition, we provide many opportunities to include parents in the educational process of their students. Parents are invited with students to attend our beginning of the year open house where they can meet their teachers and get any needed information about the upcoming school year. We offer All Pro Dad's Breakfast for our fathers and male role models to attend a breakfast with their child(ren). Additionally, we have a large percentage of parents that attend our parent/teacher conferences to discuss student progress and areas of concern. Parents are invited to multiple literacy nights with a focus on effective strategies to increase student's reading skills. Throughout our literacy events, students receive free books to provide all students an opportunity for continued growth. Ryland Heights Elementary also provides an evening opportunity to view and purchase items from the school book fair. Throughout the summer, families have the opportunity to participate in our summer reading program which reinforces strong literacy habits. Families are also invited to participate in our fall Treat and Eat to increase school and home relationships. We also offer a program for our families who have relatives raising children that meets monthly throughout the year and we strive to strengthen relationships with grandparents through evening activities such as "Games with Grandparents."

6. Describe any changes that will be made to next year's parent and family engagement program based on your evaluation.

While we have many relatives raising children, we do not have a large turnout for our Super Families Program that addresses these families. I would like to see us broaden this program to include more families in the upcoming year. We also would like to strive to create positive relationships and strengthen our family engagement programs with our youngest learners (preschool and kindergarten families.) We will continue to partner with our Parent Teacher Organization to provide increased opportunities for family engagement programs.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------