Carter G. Woodson Academy's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) for 2021-22

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 among identified subgroups of students. When implemented with fidelity, the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) cultivates an environment that promotes student growth and achievement.

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes). Through the Needs Assessment for Schools, priorities were identified and processes, practices, and/or conditions were chosen for focus. This goal building template will assist your improvement team to address those priorities and outline your targets and the activities intended to produce the desired changes. Progress monitoring details will ensure that your plan is being reviewed regularly to determine the success of each strategy.

Please note that the objectives (short-term targets) set by your school under the Achievement Gap section of this planning template will be used by the district's superintendent to determine whether or not your school met its targets to reduce the gap in student achievement for any student group for two consecutive years as required by KRS 158.649. Likewise, operational definitions for each required planning component can be found on page 2 of the planning template.

For those schools operating a Title I Schoolwide Program, this plan meets the requirements of Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act as well as state requirements under 703 KAR 5:225. **No separate Schoolwide Program Plan is required**.

Requirements for Building an Improvement Plan

- 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.

Explanations/Directions

Goal: Schools should determine long-term goals that are three to five year targets for each required school level indicator. Elementary/middle schools must address proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, and growth. High schools must address proficiency, separate academic indicator, achievement gap, graduation rate, and transition readiness. Long-term targets should be informed by The Needs Assessment for Schools.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Schools should determine short-term objectives to be attained by the end of the current academic year. There can be multiple objectives for each goal.	Describe your approach to systematically address a process, practice, or condition that was identified as a priority during the Needs Assessment for Schools. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six (6) Key Core Work Processes or another established improvement approach (i.e. *Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldridge, etc.*).	Describe the actionable steps that will occur to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy.	List the criteria that will gauge the impact of your work. The measures may be quantitative or qualitative but are observable in some way. Consider measures of input as well as outcomes for both staff and students.	Describe the process used to assess the implementation of the plan, the rate of improvement, and the effectiveness of the plan. Your description should include the artifacts to be reviewed, specific timelines, and responsible individuals.	List the funding source(s) used to support (or needed to support) the improvement initiative. If your school is a recipient of Title I, Part A funds, your CSIP serves as your annual plan and should indicate how Title I funds are utilized to carry out the planned activities.

1: Proficiency

Goal 1 (State your proficiency goal.): Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in reading from 37% to 42% and math from 23% to 28% by May 2022 as measured by the ACT assessment.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1: Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in reading from 37% to 42% by May 2022.	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy. Moves from a grading culture to a learning culture	Teachers will participate in ACT teaching and learning strategies provided through "Build Your Future" Consulting. Providing engaging instruction that promotes self-learning and accountability. Daily practice as a part of instruction and classroom expectation.	42% of scholars reaching ACT Benchmark in Reading	Bi-weekly progress from the in class practice based on use of strategies provided by "Build Your Future" Consulting.	Use of ESSR Funds
Objective 2 Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in math from 23% to 28% by May 2022.	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy. Moves from a grading culture to a learning culture	Teachers will participate in ACT teaching and learning strategies provided through "Build Your Future" Consulting. Providing engaging instruction that promotes self-learning and accountability. Daily practice as a part of instruction and classroom expectation.	28% of scholars reaching ACT Benchmark in Math	Bi-weekly progress from the in class practice based on use of strategies provided by "Build Your Future" Consulting.	Use of ESSR Funds

2: Separate Academic Indicator

Goal 2 (State your separate academic indicator goal.): Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in science from 13% to 18% and 45% of scholars scoring proficient or higher in writing by May 2022 as measured by the KAS.					
Objective	**Strategy**	**Activities**	**Measure of Success**	**Progress Monitoring**	**Funding**
Objective 1 Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in science from 13% to 18% by May 2022.	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy. Moves from a grading culture to a learning culture	Teachers will participate in ACT teaching and learning strategies provided through "Build Your Future" Consulting. Providing engaging instruction that promotes self-learning and accountability. Daily practice as a part of instruction and classroom expectation.	18% of scholars reaching ACT Benchmark in Science	Bi-weekly progress from the in class practice based on use of strategies provided by "Build Your Future" Consulting.	Use of ESSR Funds
Objective 2 45% percent of scholars scoring proficient or high in writing on KAS in by May 2022. (based on 2019 data, as 2021 data on KPREP is skewed and will be scored differently on KAS)	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy. Moves from a grading culture to a learning culture	Provide opportunity to write about topics of interest based on audio and video, multi-media experiences and across content areas as a part of weekly instruction.	45% of scholars scoring proficient or higher in writing on the KAS.	Review/revision of writing rubrics, increased opportunity to write, and review of writing samples during content based PLC monthly meetings	ESS Funds

3: Achievement Gap

KRS 158.649 requires the school-based decision making (SBDM) council, or the principal if no council exists, to set the school's yearly 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 statutory requirement, intentionally focusing on the achievement gaps that exist among a school's underserved student populations is also a vital component of the continuous improvement process. Schools should use a variety of measures and analysis when conducting its review of its achievement gaps, including a review of the school's climate and culture. Schools are not required to establish long term achievement gap goals; however, schools must establish yearly targets (objectives).

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1 Increase the ACT composite score average of 15.4 for F/R scholars to 16.4, as compared to the average score of 18.2 for those who are not F/R, by May 2022	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy. Moves from a grading culture to a learning culture	Teachers will participate in ACT teaching and learning strategies provided through "Build Your Future" Consulting. Providing engaging instruction that promotes self-learning and accountability. Daily practice as a part of instruction and classroom expectation.	Scholars who are F/R will have an average ACT composite score of 16.4 by May 2022.	Bi-weekly progress from the in class practice based on use of strategies provided by "Build Your Future" Consulting.	ESSR Funding/ESS Funding
		Additional tutoring opportunities through community partner and ESS			
Objective 2					
Objective 3					

Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding

4: Growth

Goal 4 (State your growth goal.): Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in reading from 37% to 42% and math from 23% to 28% by May 2022 as measured by the ACT assessment.					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1 Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in reading from 37% to 42% by May 2022.	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy. Moves from a grading culture to a learning culture	Teachers will participate in ACT teaching and learning strategies provided through "Build Your Future" Consulting. Providing engaging instruction that promotes self-learning and accountability. Daily practice as a part of instruction and classroom expectation.	42% of scholars reaching ACT Benchmark in Reading	Bi-weekly progress from the in class practice based on use of strategies provided by "Build Your Future" Consulting.	Use of ESSR Funds and District PD Funds
Objective 2 Increase the percentage of scholars meeting benchmark on the ACT in math from 23% to 28% by May 2022.	KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy. Moves from a grading culture to a learning culture	Teachers will participate in ACT teaching and learning strategies provided through "Build Your Future" Consulting. Providing engaging instruction that promotes self-learning and accountability. Daily practice as a part of instruction and classroom expectation.	28% of scholars reaching ACT Benchmark in Math	Bi-weekly progress from the in class practice based on use of strategies provided by "Build Your Future" Consulting.	Use of ESSR Funds and District PD Funds

5: Transition Readiness

Goal 5 (State your transition readiness goal.):					
Objective	**Strategy**	**Activities**	**Measure of Success**	**Progress Monitoring**	**Funding**
Objective 1					
Objective 2					

6: Graduation Rate

Goal 6 (State your graduation rate goal.):					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1					
Objective 2					

7: Other (Optional)

Goal 7 (State your separate goal.):					
Objective	Strategy	Activities	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring	Funding
Objective 1					
Objective 2					

Special Considerations for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) including Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Schools

TSI schools (including ATSI schools) must embed their subgroup(s) plan for improvement within their CSIPs. TSI stakeholders, including the principal and other school leaders, teachers, and parents, should carefully consider what must be done to ensure the subgroup(s) perform(s) at high levels in the state accountability system. In addition to identifying strategies and activities within the CSIP that address the specific needs of underperforming groups, provide narrative information regarding the additional requirements for TSI schools in the following chart:

Components of Turnaround Leadership Development and Support:
Consider: How will you ensure that school leadership has or develops the skills and disposition to achieve accelerated, meaningful, and sustainable increases in student achievement for underperforming subgroups? **Response:**

Identification of Critical Resources Inequities:
Consider: Describe the process used to review the allocation and use of resources (people, time, and money), any resource inequities that were identified that may contribute to underperformance, and how identified resource inequities will be addressed. **Response:**

Targeted Subgroups and Evidence-Based Interventions:

Consider: Identify the areas of need revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data that will be addressed through CSIP activities for your targeted subgroup(s). What evidence-based practice(s) will the school incorporate that specifically targets the subgroup(s) achievement that contributed to the TSI identification? How will we monitor the evidence-based practice to ensure it is implemented with fidelity? Complete the table below to document the evidence that supports the Activities outlined in this plan. Additional rows may be added to accommodate additional pieces of evidence.

Response:

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation	Uploaded in eProve
Train staff to implement inductive teaching strategies.	Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.	☒
		☐
		☐
		☐
		☐

Additional Actions That Address the Causes of Consistently Underperforming Subgroups Of Students

Consider: Describe the process used to review the learning culture related to your targeted subgroup(s) and any additional actions that were determined to address the causes of underperformance.
Response:

Special Considerations for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools

Schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) must complete the CSIP process and meet all applicable deadlines while identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI). Following the completion of the school audit, CSI schools must revise their CSIP to account for the improvement priorities identified by the audit team. The newly revised CSIP, referred to as a Turnaround Plan, must include the following items: (1) evidence-based interventions to be utilized to increase student performance and address the critical needs identified in the school audit, (2) a comprehensive list of persons and entities involved in the turnaround efforts and the specific roles each shall play in the school's turnaround process, and (3) a review of resource inequities, which shall include an analysis of school level budgeting to ensure resources are adequately channeled towards school improvement (703 KAR 5:280). Each of the three aforementioned requirements must be embedded throughout the CSIP document. Once the CSIP has been revised, the turnaround plan must be submitted to the LEA for approval before it is submitted to the Commissioner of Education for final approval.

Evidence-based Practices

The Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) created new expectations for evidence-based decision making at school and district levels. More specific information regarding evidence-based practices and requirements can be found on the Kentucky Department of Education's Evidence-based Practices website. While evidence documentation in the CSIP is only required for schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), KDE encourages all school leaders to review evidence related to new programs, practices, or interventions being implemented in the school. In addition to documenting the evidence below, TSI and CSI schools are expected to upload a description of their evidence review process, the findings of their evidence review, and a discussion of the local implications into eProve. Specific directions regarding the documentation requirements can be found in the "Documenting Evidence under ESSA" resource available on KDE's Evidence-based Practices website.

Complete the table below to document the evidence that supports the Activities outlined in this plan. Additional rows may be added to accommodate additional pieces of evidence.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation	Uploaded in eProve
Train staff to implement inductive teaching strategies.	Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.	☒
		☐
		☐
		☐
		☐

![Cognia logo]

2021-22 Phase One: CGWA Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools_09202021_11:32

2021-22 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools

Carter G. Woodson Academy
Jaynae Boateng
2000 Winchester Road
Lexington, Kentucky, 40509
United States of America

2021-22 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools - 2021-22 Phase One: CGWA Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools_09202021_11:32 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Table of Contents

2021-22 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools - 2021-22 Phase One: CGWA Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools_09202021_11:32 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

2021-22 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 2021-22 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
• Professional Development Plan for Schools

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. I also assure that the comprehensive school improvement plan is developed by the school council, (where applicable) with the input of parents, faculty, and staff.

2021-22 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools - 2021-22 Phase One: CGWA Continuous Improvement Diagnostic for Schools_09202021_11:32 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Please enter your name and date below to certify.

Jaynae Boateng 9/20/2021

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Carter G. Woodson Academy
Jaynae Boateng
2000 Winchester Road
Lexington, Kentucky, 40509
United States of America

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37 -

Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Table of Contents

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment for Schools

The Needs Assessment Diagnostic will facilitate the use of multiple sources of data to determine the current reality and establish a foundation for decision-making around school goals and strategies. Once completed, the diagnostic will lead to priorities to be addressed in the comprehensive school improvement plan to build staff capacity and increase student achievement. The needs assessment 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).

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes).

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 to 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.

Protocol

1. Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results to determine the priorities from this year's needs assessment. Include names of school councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved, a timeline of the process, the specific data reviewed, and how the meetings are documented.

Teachers and admin team reviewed and analyzed data results from 2020 ACT Benchmarks for high school and MAP for middle school to determine what content areas to focus on this school year using our ESSER funds to address specific areas. Our high school ACT data revealed: 81% of 10th grade & 86% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Math Benchmark 70% of 10th grade & 78% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Reading Benchmark 88% of 10th grade & 86% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Science Benchmark 63% of 10th grade & 71% of 11th did not meet ACT English Benchmark Our middle school 2020 MAP data revealed: 53% of 6th grade are in 61-80%ile (average/hi ave) in reading/ 30% of 6th grade are in 81%ile or higher &

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

17% are in 40%ile (low average/low) or lower 87% of 7th grade are in 41-80%ile (average/hi ave) in reading & 13% of 7th grade in 40%ile (low average) and lower 44% of 8th grade are in 41-80%ile (ave/hi ave) in reading & 56% are in 40%ile (low ave/low) and lower According to the fall 2021 PSAT baseline data our 10th and 11th grade scholars are performing below benchmarks with only 52% of 10th grade and 45% of 11th grade meeting the ERW benchmark . Only 16% of 10th grade and 14% of 11th grade meeting the Math benchmark. Our 2020 ACT data showed our juniors and sophomores were not meeting benchmarks in any area. Our average ACT score was 17.2. Our middle school 2021 fall Imagine Math data revealed that our scholars are performing at the Novice and Apprentice levels which is 1 to 2 grade levels below expectation. Their math skills are deficient. According to our fall Galileo Math results, more than half of our middle school population is not meeting benchmark standards. Our fall Galileo ELA results show about 50% of scholars are meeting benchmark standards and 50% are not. Our fall MAP Math scores showed that 63% of our current 6th graders scored average or above while 37% performed low average/low. Our 6th grade MAP Reading scores were the same percentages. Our 7th grade MAP Math scores showed 70% scoring average or higher while 30% scored low average/low. 81% of our 7th grade scored average/higher on MAP Reading while 19% scored low average/low. 67% of our 8th grade scored low average/low on MAP Math and 58% of them scored average/higher on MAP Reading.

Trends

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

Example of Trends
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2019-20 to 288 in 2020-21.
- From 2018 to 2020, the school saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.

Failures for school year 2020-21- 3 for middle & 1 for high Demographics- 77.95% AA/ 12.93% Hispanic/ 3.42% White/ 5.32% Other FRAM Report- 66% F/R schoolwide 47.15% of AA are F/R 12.55% of Hispanic are F/R 2.66% of White are F/R 3.42% of Other are F/R

Current State

3. Plainly state the current condition of the school using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by multiple sources of outcome data. Cite the source of data

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

used.

Example of Current Academic State:

- Thirty-four percent (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- Fifty-four percent (54%) of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 57%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2020-21 academic year.
- Survey results and perception data indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

81% of 10th grade & 86% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Math Benchmark 70% of 10th grade & 78% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Reading Benchmark 88% of 10th grade & 86% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Science Benchmark 63% of 10th grade & 71% of 11th did not meet ACT English Benchmark According to the fall 2021 PSAT baseline data our 10th and 11th grade scholars are performing below benchmarks with only 52% of 10th grade and 45% of 11th grade meeting the ERW benchmark . Only 16% of 10th grade and 14% of 11th grade meeting the Math benchmark. Our 2020 ACT data showed our juniors and sophomores were not meeting benchmarks in any area. Our average ACT score was 17.2. Our middle school 2021 fall Imagine Math data revealed that our scholars are performing at the Novice and Apprentice levels which is 1 to 2 grade levels below expectation. Their math skills are deficient. According to our fall Galileo Math results, more than half of our middle school population is not meeting benchmark standards. Our fall Galileo ELA results show about 50% of scholars are meeting benchmark standards and 50% are not. Our fall MAP Math scores showed that 63% of our current 6th graders scored average or above while 37% performed low average/low. Our 6th grade MAP Reading scores were the same percentages. Our 7th grade MAP Math scores showed 70% scoring average or higher while 30% scored low average/low. 81% of our 7th grade scored average/higher on MAP Reading while 19% scored low average/low. 67% of our 8th grade scored low average/low on MAP Math and 58% of them scored average/ higher on MAP Reading.

Priorities/Concerns

4. Clearly and concisely identify the greatest areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.
NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template.

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

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.

> 81% of 10th grade & 86% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Math Benchmark 70% of 10th grade & 78% of 11th grade did not meet ACT Reading Benchmark Fall MAP Math for 6th grade- 37% scored low average/low 7th grade- 30% scored low average/low 8th grade- 67% scored low average/low Fall MAP Reading for 7th grade- 37% scored low average/low 7th grade- 19% scored low average/low 8th grade

Strengths/Leverages

5. Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school. Explain how they may be utilized to improve areas of concern listed above.

Example: Reading achievement has increased from 37% proficient to its current rate of 58%. The systems of support we implemented for reading can be adapted to address our low performance in math.

> 87% of 7th grade are in 41-80%ile (average/hi ave) in reading according to 2020 MAP data

Evaluate the Teaching and Learning Environment

6. Consider the processes, practices and conditions evident in the teaching and learning environment as identified in 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

Utilizing implementation data, perception data, and current policies and practices:
a. Complete the Key Elements Template.
b. Upload your completed template in the attachment area below.

After analyzing the Key Elements of your teaching and learning environment, which processes, practices or conditions will the school focus its resources and efforts upon in

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37 -

Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

order to produce the desired changes?

Note that all processes, practices and conditions can be linked to the six Key Core Work Processes.

NOTE: These elements will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template.

> This year teachers will focus on ACT instructional strategies, practice ACT tests, teaching students how to prepare for the ACT and introducing and exposing middle school students to the ACT like reading passages and problems.

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09202021_11:37 -
Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)

2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools_11292021_14:42

2021-22 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools

Carter G. Woodson Academy
Jaynae Boateng
2000 Winchester Road
Lexington, Kentucky, 40509
United States of America

2021-22 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools_11292021_14:42 -
Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Table of Contents

2021-22 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools_11292021_14:42 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

2021-22 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?

CGWA is a college preparatory academy grades -12. There are 135 scholars in middle school grades 6-8 and 129 scholars in high school grades 9-12 for a total of 264. We are located inside of Frederick Douglass High school at 2000 Winchester Road, Lexington, KY 40509. We continue to grow the program each year by taking an incoming 6th grade class of 50. This school year we returned to in-person learning in August 2020 after being virtual for an entire school year. Our program is trying to make up academic decline for all scholars and accelerate their learning while filling achievement gaps that have grown due to the pandemic.

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 Fayette County Public Schools is to create a collaborative community that ensures all students achieve at high levels and graduate prepared to excel in a global society. The mission of Carter G. Woodson Academy is to educate, motivate and activate the potential for excellence that lies in every young male.

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.

On Nov. 10, 2021 the school had a Honor Roll Celebration for middle school scholars who had a GPA of 3.0-3.4 and 3.5- 4.0. 91% of middle school scholars made the honor roll 1st quarter (123 scholars out of 135). The grade level breakdown is as follows: 6th grade had 39 out of 43 scholars make honor roll (91%), 7th grade had 43 out of 46(93%) and 8th grade had 41 out of 46 scholars(89%). A total of 33 middle school scholars had 3.0-3.4 GPA and 90 scholars had 3.5- 4.0. Areas of Improvement are math and reading schoolwide. According to the fall 2021 PSAT baseline data our 10th and 11th grade scholars are performing below benchmarks with only 52% of 10th grade and 45% of 11th grade meeting the ERW benchmark . Only 16% of 10th grade and 14% of 11th grade meeting the Math benchmark. Our 2020 ACT data

2021-22 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools_11292021_14:42 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

showed our juniors and sophomores were not meeting benchmarks in any area. Our average ACT score was 17.2. Our middle school Imagine Math data revealed that our scholars are performing at the Novice and Apprentice levels which is 1 to 2 grade levels below expectation. Their math skills are deficient. According to our fall Galileo Math results, more than half of our middle school population is not meeting benchmark standards. Our fall Galileo ELA results show about 50% of scholars are meeting benchmark standards and 50% are not. Our fall MAP Math scores showed that 63% of our current 6th graders scored average or above while 37% performed low average/low. Our 6th grade MAP Reading scores were the same percentages. Our 7th grade MAP Math scores showed 70% scoring average or higher while 30% scored low average/low. 81% of our 7th grade scored average/higher on MAP Reading while 19% scored low average/low. 67% of our 8th grade scored low average/low on MAP Math and 58% of them scored average/higher on MAP Reading.

Additional Information

CSI/TSI Schools (including ATSI) 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.

N/A

2021-22 Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Executive Summary for Schools_11292021_14:42 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)

2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools

Carter G. Woodson Academy
Jaynae Boateng
2000 Winchester Road
Lexington, Kentucky, 40509
United States of America

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Table of Contents

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools

The purpose of this diagnostic is to support the school in designing and implementing a professional development plan that aligns to the goals established in KRS 158.6451 and the local needs assessment. The basis of the professional development plan aligns to 704 KAR 3:035, which states the following:

Annual Professional Development Plan:

Section 2. Each local school and district shall develop a process to design a professional development plan that meets the goals established in KRS 158.6451 and in the local needs assessment. A school professional development plan shall be incorporated into the school improvement plan and shall be made public prior to the implementation of the plan. The local district professional development plan shall be incorporated into the district improvement plan and posted to the local district Web site prior to the implementation of the plan.

Section 3. Each school and local district professional development plan shall contain the following elements:

1. A clear statement of the school or district mission
2. Evidence of representation of all persons affected by the professional development plan
3. A needs assessment analysis
4. Professional development objectives that are focused on the school or district mission, derived from the needs assessment, and specify changes in educator practice needed to improve student achievement; and
5. A process for evaluating impact on student learning and improving professional learning, using evaluation results

Research demonstrates a positive link between high-quality professional learning (HQPL), teaching practices and student outcomes. Effective professional learning not only has the potential to improve both classroom instruction and student outcomes, but also it can be effective in recruiting and retaining teachers. When designing and/or selecting HQPL at the local level, it is important to ensure alignment to the characteristics of High-Quality Professional Learning.

   1. What is the school's mission?

   The mission of Carter G. Woodson Academy is to educate, motivate and activate the potential for excellence that lies within every young male.

   2. The needs assessment provides the framework for **all** schools to clearly identify their most critical areas for improvement that will be addressed in the planning process through the development of goals, objectives, strategies and activities.

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Based on the most critical areas for improvement identified in the completed needs assessment per [703 KAR 5:225](#) (3), what are the school's **top two priorities** for professional development that support continuous improvement?

According to the fall 2021 PSAT baseline data our 10th and 11th grade scholars are performing below benchmarks with only 52% of 10th grade and 45% of 11th grade meeting the ERW benchmark . Only 16% of 10th grade and 14% of 11th grade meeting the Math benchmark. Our 2020 ACT data showed our juniors and sophomores were not meeting benchmarks in any area. Our average ACT score was 17.2. Our middle school Imagine Math data revealed that our scholars are performing at the Novice and Apprentice levels which is 1 to 2 grade levels below expectation. Their math skills are deficient. According to our fall Galileo Math results, more than half of our middle school population is not meeting benchmark standards. Our fall Galileo ELA results show about 50% of scholars are meeting benchmark standards and 50% are not. Our fall MAP Math scores showed that 63% of our current 6th graders scored average or above while 37% performed low average/low. Our 6th grade MAP Reading scores were the same percentages. Our 7th grade MAP Math scores showed 70% scoring average or higher while 30% scored low average/low. 81% of our 7th grade scored average/higher on MAP Reading while 19% scored low average/low. 67% of our 8th grade scored low average/low on MAP Math and 58% of them scored average/higher on MAP Reading. Therefore, our top priority for our PD this school year will be ACT addressing math, reading, English, writing and science for high school and exposing middle school to ACT via vocabulary, ACT like items and to better prepare them to meet benchmarks in high school. Middle school will focus on reading and math using the Galileo and Imagine Learning Math assessments as the measure of mastery.

3. How do the identified **top two priorities** of professional development relate to school goals?

Our PD priority is aligned to our school goal to meet ACT and PSAT benchmarks in every area for high school scholars and have middle school scholars meet benchmark standards on Galileo and Imagine Learning Math as well as show growth on winter and spring MAP.

4a. For the first priority need, what are the specific objectives for the professional development aligned to the school goal(s)? Consider the long and short term changes that need to occur in order to meet the goal.

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Using our ESSER funds, we have contacted with Build Your Own Future Consulting/ Dr. Bowles to work with teachers over the next two years on ACT strategies to teach and include in their instruction to better prepare scholars to take the ACT. The first year Dr. Bowles is giving an overview of how the ACT is organized, providing teacher with ACT tips on how to take the ACT, sharing ACT examples for reading, math, science, English and writing and providing content specific information to core teachers and supporting ACT information to CTE teachers. Juniors and sophomores will take the ACT in spring 2022 and starting January 2022 teachers will be required to incorporate an ACT like bellringer and exit slip to give scholars consistent practice. Middle school scholars will take Galileo, Imagine Learning Math and MAP again (winter) with the expectation of meeting benchmarks and showing individual academic growth in reading and math.

4b. What are the intended results? (student outcomes; educator beliefs, practices, etc.)

The intended results is to teach scholars how to take the ACT, how to prepare for the ACT and how to increase the individual ACT score. The intended results for teachers to be more knowledgeable about the ACT and how to use various instructional strategies in their instruction to help scholars improve their scores by meeting benchmark or higher in each area for college readiness and to qualify for more scholarships. The intended results for middle school is to perform at average/ higher on winter MAP and meet or exceed standard benchmarks on Galileo and Imagine Learning Math.

4c. What will be the indicators of success? Consider the completed actions or markers that need to occur that would indicate the goals and objectives have been achieved.

ACT scores are meeting benchmark or higher in each area for college readiness and qualifying for scholarships. Middle school scholars will be meeting or exceeding benchmarks demonstrating mastery of standards according to Galileo and meeting skills benchmarks on Imagine Learning Math.

4d. Who is the targeted audience for the professional development?

Middle and high school teachers (content & CTE) are the targeted audience for our PD.

4e. Who is impacted by this component of professional development? (students, teachers, principals, district leaders, etc.)

Teachers, scholars and admin team are impacted by our PD.

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

4f. What resources are needed to support the professional development? (staff, funding, technology, materials, time, etc.)

We are using our ESSER funds. The district provides the Galileo, Imagine Learning and MAP as well as tech tools for instruction.

4g. What ongoing supports will be provided for professional development implementation? (coaching, professional learning communities, follow up, etc.)

Dr. Bowles is providing ongoing coaching. Our teachers meet in PLCs to receive the PD training and follow up.

4h. How will the professional development be monitored for evidence of implementation? Consider data (student work samples, grade-level assessments, classroom observations, etc.) that will be gathered, persons responsible and frequency of data analysis.

PD implementation will be monitored by: evaluating administrators district, state and national assessment data walkthrough & classroom observations scholar work

5a. For the second priority need, what are the specific objectives for the professional development aligned to the school goal(s)? Consider the long and short term changes that need to occur in order to meet the goal.

N/A

5b. What are the intended results? (student outcomes; educator beliefs, practices, etc.)

N/A

5c. What will be the indicators of success? Consider the completed actions or markers that need to occur that would indicate the goals and objectives have been achieved.

N/A

5d. Who is the targeted audience for the professional development?

N/A

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

5e. Who is impacted by this component of professional development? (students, teachers, principals, district leaders, etc.)

N/A

5f. What resources are needed to support the professional development? (staff, funding, technology, materials, time, etc.)

N/A

5g. What ongoing supports will be provided for professional development implementation? (coaching, professional learning communities, follow up, etc.)

N/A

5h. How will the professional development be monitored for evidence of implementation? Consider data (student work samples, grade-level assessments, classroom observations, etc.) that will be gathered, persons responsible and frequency of data analysis.

N/A

6. Optional Extension: If your school has identified additional professional development priorities that you would like to include, you may upload an attachment with the answers to question 3 and a-h as seen in questions 4 and 5. If you do not wish to include an optional extension, please list N/A in the space provided below.

N/A

2021-22 Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools - 2021-22 CGWA Phase Three: Professional Development Plan for Schools_11302021_12:09 - Generated on 01/27/2022

Carter G. Woodson Academy

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)