Garden Springs Elementary 2019-20 Phase Three:
Executive Summary for Schools

Garden Springs Elementary School
Joey Sheroan
2151 Garden Springs Dr
Lexington, Kentucky, 40504
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/06/2019
Status: Open
Garden Springs Elementary originally opened in August 1964 as one of the first open-classroom schools in the nation. In early 1988, fire damaged the school extensively. It was rebuilt and reopened for classes in August 1988. Though the open classroom concept is no longer in place at GSE, the collaborative and teamwork concepts of the open-classroom system remain. This collaborative and teamwork model that the school was built on is most present today in the schoolwide implementation of Kagan cooperative learning strategies to meet the learning needs of all students in meeting the increased rigor of the common core standards. We also have a true professional learning community where all staff play an important part in collaborating to improve our school. In addition, parents work as partners in our school. We have a strong PTA who contributes to assisting with the needs of our school and parents provide input into our improvement efforts through our parent school improvement process. Garden Springs Elementary is home to 405 students in grades Kindergarten - 5. GSE proudly serves families in the southwest part of Lexington primarily living in the subdivisions of Garden Springs, Clemens Heights, Dogwood Trace, and Firebrook. Garden Springs employs approximately 36 certified teachers. Our overall enrollment numbers have slowly declined over the past several years. Garden Springs Elementary students mirror the diversity found in the community the school serves. The ethnic diversity consists of 67.4% of students white (non-Hispanic), 8.7% African American, 16.2% Hispanic, and 7.7% two or more races. 47.8% of students at Garden Springs are are identified as economically disadvantaged. Beginning in June 2013 Garden Springs began an extensive renovation project that was completed during the summer of 2015. This renovation included a complete remodel of all existing spaces, the addition of 5 regular classrooms, 2 early start classrooms, a science lab, a new music and art room, and new front office and administration space. The expansion and update greatly improved the library and cafeteria. This renovation ensures that students at Garden Springs can continue to have access to top level resources and technology needed to meet the demands of the 21st Century.

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.

Garden Springs Elementary Mission Statement
Garden Springs Elementary exists to create a collaborative community of learners that ensures all students achieve at high levels and are prepared for lifelong success in a global society.

Garden Springs Elementary Vision Statement:
Garden Springs Elementary envisions a learning community that promotes superior student success in all areas through sustaining a culture of high expectations and mutual respect between all stakeholders. Garden Springs will be a "School of Distinction" by focusing exclusively on what is best for students.

Student Achievement
Garden Springs envisions a systematic, research supported, tiered instructional model that intentionally uses ALL instructional minutes to allow ALL students to reach and/or exceed proficiency levels and yearly make and/or exceed a year's growth through meeting the individual needs of all students.

Community Engagement
Garden Springs envisions a partnership with the community by which community members and businesses work alongside the school to provide students rich and relevant learning experiences that prepare them to be contributing members of the community in the future.
envisions a partnership with families where, through effective communication and education, the school and families are able to communicate to students and community members how the school and families systematically work to support each other to ensure student achievement through a combined home-school effort.

Student Engagement
Garden Springs envisions intentionally planned instruction that fosters student engagement through students interacting, communicating, creating, and problem solving with content through the use of learning structures that prepare students for work in a global society.

Staff Engagement
Garden Springs envisions a staff culture that is built around collaboration, mutual respect, intentional team based decision making, and a relentless commitment to continuous improvement and student first decision making.

Garden Springs believes that it our responsibility to provide students a safe environment where they know they are cared for and respected so that all students are able to meet the demands of high level teaching and learning.

Garden Springs offers a variety of opportunities to engage all stakeholders. Community partners provide students with health and wellness support, teach students important life lessons during school assemblies and assist with school activities such as the REAL Men Read program. Parents are invited to attend open house, parent conferences, Title I Family Engagement Nights, PTA events and various school activities throughout the year. We have high expectations for learning for all students throughout the regular school day. Outside the school day, students have the opportunity to engage in a variety of activities including Chorus, Girls on the Run, Golf Club, Tennis Club, Battle of the Books, and Cross Country.

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.

At Garden Springs, we were excited to earn a four star ranking on the 2019 KPREP assessment. Our overall KPREP score put us in the top 25% of all elementary schools in Kentucky. Our reading, math, writing, social studies, and science KPREP assessment scores were above our district and the state averages. We are excited to offer new reading, math, and science programs that are consistent across all grade levels. The Reading Wonders program, the Investigations/Envisions Math program, and the Amplify Science provide students with a rigorous curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core Standards and includes a variety of resources that allow teachers to provide activities to meet the individual needs of our students. Teachers have been involved in ongoing training to ensure they are using the programs effectively. We are also one of only a few schools who was awarded both the Math Achievement Fund Grant and the Read to Achieve Fund grant. These grants have provided additional staffing, resources, and professional learning opportunities to address academic deficits for at risk students. We are focusing our improvement efforts around closing the achievement gap between sub groups of students and our overall population. We are implementing a variety of strategies to improve Tier I instruction and student support services to close these achievement gaps.

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.

We were not identified as a CSI or TSI school.

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 Garden Springs, we continue to strive to improve our academic performance, as well as the social, emotional and behavioral growth of our students. We are able to accomplish this as a collaborative community of staff, students, and parents who are committed to continuous improvement.
2019-20 Phase One: Continuous Improvement Diagnostic

Garden Springs Elementary School
Joey Sheroan
2151 Garden Springs Dr
Lexington, Kentucky, 40504
United States of America

Last Modified: 09/22/2019
Status: Open
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.

Joey Sheroan - September 22, 2019
2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment

Garden Springs Elementary School
Joey Sheroan
2151 Garden Springs Dr
Lexington, Kentucky, 40504
United States of America

Last Modified: 01/07/2020
Status: Open
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?

At Garden Springs Elementary, we use a variety of approaches to ensure stakeholders are involved in the improvement planning process. Stakeholder groups include parents, district level administration, community partners, and faculty and staff from our school. All of these stakeholder groups play an important part in the development of our school improvement plan. Parents have been involved through our school based council, during our School Improvement Parent Forum, and through family surveys. SBDM parents are elected to serve as council members and contribute to our school improvement efforts. They are informed of their roles and responsibilities at their first council meeting. We schedule monthly meetings after school hours to allow parents, teachers and community members the opportunity to attend these meetings. At our monthly SBDM meetings, we analyze a variety of academic, behavioral and attendance data. We use this data to celebrate accomplishments and to create strategies to address areas of need. Parents also have an opportunity to get involved in the improvement process by participating in our School Improvement Parent Forum. This platform allows parents the opportunity to provide feedback about our improvement efforts and gives them a chance to share their ideas for improvement. Finally, parents have an opportunity to provide feedback by completing our parent satisfaction survey. Faculty and staff are involved through their participation during faculty meetings, PLC meetings, and during School Improvement Team meetings. All teachers participate in our weekly faculty and PLC meetings. We use this time to analyze a variety of data to determine our progress toward improvement goals and activities to implement to meet these goals. The School Improvement Team is made up of team leads from all grade levels and departments. This team meets after school and they are a key part of our school improvement planning. Minutes are kept for all School Improvement Team meetings. District level administration has been involved by providing support and guidance throughout the improvement planning process. They are instrumental in helping us secure high quality professional learning opportunities for our teachers. The professional learning opportunities directly impact the teaching and learning taking place in the classroom. All of these stakeholder groups are instrumental in analyzing a variety of data to determine needs in our school, identify improvement efforts that will address these needs, and monitoring progress toward our school-wide goals.
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.

**Current Academic State**

KPREP Assessment Results
- 17.7% of students scored novice in reading in 2019 compared to 17.1% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a .6% increase in the percentage of novice students on the reading assessment. 59.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in reading in 2019 compared to 57.2% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 2.5% increase. 12.4% of students scored novice in math in 2019 compared to 17.1% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 4.7% reduction in the percentage of novice students on the math assessment. 60.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in math in 2019 compared to 54.9% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 5.3% increase. The overall proficiency score for math increased from 75.5 in 2018 to 77.8 in 2019 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 2.3 point increase. 6% of students scored novice in social studies in 2019 compared to 12.2% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 6.2% reduction in the percentage of novice students on the social studies assessment. 71.1% of students scored proficient/distinguished in social studies in 2019 compared to 56.7% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 14.4% increase in the percentage of proficient/distinguished students. 10.5% of students scored novice in science in 2019 compared to 15.1% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 4.6% reduction in novice students. 34.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in science in 2019 compared to 34.9% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a reduction of .7 13.3% of students scored novice in writing in 2019 compared to 27.8% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a reduction of 14.5% novice students in on demand writing. 56.3% of students scored proficient/distinguished in writing in 2019 compared to 30% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 26.6% increase in proficient/distinguished students in on demand writing. We have substantial gaps between our African American, Hispanic, EL Monitored, Economically Disadvantaged, and Disability IEP students when compared to all students in both reading and math. MAP Assessment Results
- 75% of all students scored above the 40th percentile on the spring 2019 MAP reading assessment compared to 72% in spring of 2018. This is a 3% increase. 67.4% of all students met their spring to spring growth goal in reading on the 2019 spring MAP assessment. 78% of all students scored above the 40th percentile on the spring 2019 MAP math assessment compared to 68% in spring of 2018. This is a 10% increase. 76.2% of all students met their spring to spring growth goal in math on the 2019 spring MAP assessment. Non-Academic Current State
- The student attendance rate for 18 - 19 was 95.02% compared to 95.79% in 17 - 18. Our school averaged .8 office discipline referrals per day in 2018 -

- Learning Targets - 96.9% evident
- Activity Aligned to Outcome - 86.7% evident
- Assessment Criteria - 46.9% evident
- Questioning - 18.8% evident
- Active Participation - 93.8%
- Engages Diverse Group of Students - 96.9%
- High Level Engagement/High Level Task - 31.3%
- Follow Behavioral Expectations - 100%
- Speak and Interact Respectfully - 100%
- Student Use of Technology to Demonstrate Learning - 9.4%
- Feedback - 93.8%
- Materials Reflect Cultural Diversity - 100%
- Differentiation - 25%
- High Yield Strategy - 74.2%

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment Name**

- Garden Springs Elementary SY 18 - 19 School Profile
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.

Reading
17.7% of students scored novice in reading in 2019 compared to 17.1% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a .6% increase in the percentage of novice students on the reading assessment. 67.4% of all students met their spring to spring growth goal in reading on the 2019 spring MAP assessment.

Science
34.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in science in 2019 compared to 34.9% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a reduction of .7. The following sub groups have significant gaps compared to all students based on the KPREP assessment in each of the following content areas:

- **Math**
  - All Students - 12.4% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP math test.
  - African American Students - 35.7% of African American students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP math test.
  - English Learners Plus Monitored Students - 29.4% of EL Monitored students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP math test.

- **Reading**
  - All Students - 17.7% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP reading test.
  - African American Students - 28.5% of African American students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP reading test.
  - Hispanic Students - 34.9% of Hispanic students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP reading test.
  - English Learners Plus Monitored Students - 44.1% of EL Monitored students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP reading test.

- **Writing**
  - All Students - 13.3% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP writing test.
  - English Learners Plus Monitored Students - 20% of EL Monitored students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP writing test.

- **Science**
  - All Students - 10.5% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP science test.
  - English Learners Plus Monitored Students - 45.5% of EL Monitored students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP science test.

- **Social Studies**
  - All Students - 6% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the KPREP social studies test.

**Combined Reading and Math NAPD Gap Ratings**

- White - 86.5
- Hispanic - 55.5
- Difference - 31

**Economically Disadvantaged Students**

- Not Economically Disadvantaged - 94.6
- Economically Disadvantaged - 61.6
- Difference - 33

**Not EL Plus Monitored**

- EL Plus Monitored - 46.7
- Difference - 36.6

**Reading Growth**

The performance level of 42 of our 159 students in 4th and 5th grade declined from the previous year in reading. The performance level of 67 students stayed the same. Of those 67 students, 54 students stayed at proficient or distinguished. Math Growth

The performance level of 24 of our 154 students in 4th and 5th grade declined from the previous year in math. The performance level of 78 students stayed the same. Of those 78 students, 58 students stayed at proficient or distinguished.

**Walkthrough Data**

- Items that are scoring below 80%
  - Assessment Criteria - 46.9% evident
  - Questioning - 18.8% evident
  - High Level Engagement
  - High Level Task
31.3% Student Use of Technology to Demonstrate Learning - 9.4% Differentiation - 25% High Yield Strategy - 74.2% Student Attendance

The student attendance rate for 18 - 19 was 95.02% compared to 95.79% in 17 - 18.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

Garden Springs Elementary SY 18 - 19 School Profile
Analyzing data trends from the previous two academic years, which academic, cultural and behavioral measures remain significant areas for improvement?

We are not reducing the percentage of students scoring novice in reading on the KPREP assessment. 17.1% of students scored novice in reading in 2018 and 17.7% scored novice in reading in 2019. This is a .6% increase. 32.6% of students did not meet their growth goal in reading from spring of 2018 to spring of 2019. There are substantial gaps between all sub groups as compared to all students in both reading and math based on KPREP assessment data. The sub groups who are under-performing include African American, Hispanic, EL Monitored Students, Economically Disadvantaged, and Disability Students with an IEP. Overall scores for each of these groups can be found on the attached chart. Science - Only 34.2% of students are scoring proficient and we do not have any distinguished students. The majority of students (55.3%) are scoring apprentice in science. Our growth indicator score of 63.8 is the lowest of our three indicator scores. Our proficiency indicator score is 77.8 and our Separate Academic Indicator score is 73.8. The following areas scored below 80% on classroom walkthrough baseline data. Assessment Criteria - 46.9% evident Questioning - 18.8% evident High Level Engagement/High Level Task - 31.3% Student Use of Technology to Demonstrate Learning - 9.4% Differentiation - 25% High Yield Strategy - 74.2%

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment Name**

- Garden Springs Elementary SY 18 - 19 School Profile
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

We will focus our improvement efforts around KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction. We are participating in a number of professional learning opportunities centered around our reading program (Reading Wonders), our new math programs (Investigations/EnVisions), our new science program (Amplify) and around our school-wide writing plan. We also plan to deliver professional learning opportunities to improve assessment criteria, questioning, task analysis, engagement, differentiation, and high yield strategies. Teachers will gain knowledge that will help improve instructional practices in the classroom.
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%.

KRPEP Assessment Results
59.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in reading in 2019 compared to 57.2% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 2.5 % increase.
12.4% of students scored novice in math in 2019 compared to 17.1% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 4.7% reduction in the percentage of novice students on the math assessment.
60.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in math in 2019 compared to 54.9% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 5.3% increase. The overall proficiency score for math increased from 75.5 in 2018 to 77.8 in 2019 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 2.3 point increase.
6% of students scored novice in social studies in 2019 compared to 12.2% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 6.2% reduction in novice students.
71.1% of students scored proficient/distinguished in social studies in 2019 compared to 56.7% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 14.4% increase in the percentage of proficient/distinguished students.
10.5% of students scored novice in science in 2019 compared to 15.1% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 4.6% reduction in novice students.
13.3% of students scored novice in writing in 2019 compared to 27.8% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a reduction of 14.5% novice students in on demand writing.
56.3% of students scored proficient/distinguished in writing in 2019 compared to 30% in 2018 as measured by the KPREP assessment. This is a 26.6% increase in proficient/distinguished students in on demand writing.

MAP Assessment Results
75% of all students scored above the 40th percentile on the spring 2019 MAP reading assessment compared to 72% in spring of 2018. This is a 3% increase.
78% of all students scored above the 40th percentile on the spring 2019 MAP math assessment compared to 68% in spring of 2018. This is a 10% increase.

Non-Academic Data
Our school averaged .8 office discipline referrals per day in 2018 - 2019 compared to 1.14 in 2017 - 2018.

Walkthrough Data - We are seeing the following over 80% of the time during classroom walkthroughs.
- Learning Targets - 96.9%
- Activity Aligned to Outcome - 86.7%
- Engages Diverse Group of Students - 96.9%
- Follow Behavioral Expectations - 100%
- Speak and Interact Respectfully - 100%
- Feedback - 93.8%
- Materials Reflect Cultural Diversity - 100%
- High Yield Strategy - 74.2%

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

Garden Springs Elementary SY 18 - 19 School Profile
## Attachment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Associated Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden Springs Elementary SY 18 - 19 School Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garden Springs Elementary 2019-20 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic

Garden Springs Elementary School
Joey Sheroan
2151 Garden Springs Dr
Lexington, Kentucky, 40504
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/10/2019
Status: Open
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.

There are three gap groups that have been identified for improvement including Hispanic students, EL monitored students, and economically disadvantaged students. 16.2% of our students are Hispanic, 3.5% of our students are EL monitored students, and 47.8% of our students are economically disadvantaged based on free/reduced lunch status.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

GSE Achievement Gap Group Identification
II. Achievement Gap Analysis

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

The climate and culture of Garden Springs is one that is positive, respectful, and motivating for both students and staff. Staff members act and make decisions based on a common understanding that all students can achieve at high levels. Staff members are welcoming and embrace their role in developing and fostering growth in students regardless of race, socio-economic status, or disability. We teach character education regularly through the PATHS program to promote a positive school climate and to prepare students to be productive citizens. We also have a strong focus on improving our PBIS program to proactively teach and reward positive behavior. Parents and community are our partners in our effort to foster a learning environment where all students can achieve at high levels and are prepared to excel in a global society. We are working to continuously improve our programs that serve our Gap population including ELL, MTSS, special education and Culturally Responsive Teaching.

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

We increased the percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/distinguished in math from 38.5% in 17-18 to 41.9% in 18-19. We decreased the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring novice in math from 27.3% in 17-18 to 21.7% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/distinguished in math from 38.3% in 17-18 to 43.5% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of EL Monitored students scoring proficient/distinguished in math from 32.3% in 17-18 to 35.3% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/distinguished in social studies from 20% in 17-18 to 33.3% in 18-19. We decreased the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring novice in social studies from 17.9% in 17-18 to 9.5% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/distinguished in social studies from 38.5% in 17-18 to 50% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/distinguished in writing from 20% in 17-18 to 13.3% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/distinguished in writing from 10% in 17-18 to 46.7% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/distinguished in writing from 33.3% in 17-18 to 16.7% in 18-19. We increased the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/distinguished in writing from 17.9% in 17-18 to 40.5% in 18-19. Our Economically Disadvantaged student gap in reading reduced from a 37.7% proficiency gap in 17-18 to a 36.7% proficiency gap in 18-19. Our EL student gap in math reduced from a 42.2% proficiency gap in 17-18 to a 40.2% proficiency gap in 18-19.

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.

Our Hispanic students have shown progress based on increased proficiency in math, social studies, and writing. Our Economically Disadvantaged students have shown progress based on increased proficiency in math, social studies, and writing. Our Economically Disadvantaged student gap in reading reduced from a 37.7% proficiency gap in 17-18 to a 36.7% proficiency gap in 18-19. Our EL student gap in math reduced from a 42.2% proficiency gap in 17-18 to a 40.2% proficiency gap in 18-19.
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.

The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading decreased from 33.3% in 17-18 to 27.9% in 18-19. The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading decreased from 38.3% in 17-18 to 41.7% in 18-19. The percentage of EL Monitored students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading decreased from 32.3% in 17-18 to 23.5% in 18-19. Our Economically Disadvantaged student gap in math increased from a 33% proficiency gap in 17-18 to a 34% proficiency gap in 18-19. Our EL student gap in reading increased from a 50.4% proficiency gap in 17-18 to a 51.9% proficiency gap in 18-19.

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

One of the key barriers preventing us from closing the achievement gap with our Hispanic students and EL Monitored students is the lack of knowledge with evidence-based strategies designed to promote learning for these students. Our Economically Disadvantaged students arrive in Kindergarten with a gap compared to Non-Economically Disadvantaged students. We feel preschool for these students would help reduce the gap and prepare them for entry into kindergarten.

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.

All teachers are involved in analyzing data to identify areas of growth within the school. Our School Improvement Team which consists of team leads from all grade levels and departments also play a key role in our improvement planning process. Based on the findings, strategies and activities are developed and included in our Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). Support is also provided from the district to help with the CSIP process. We also involve parents in our improvement planning process during the School Improvement Parent Forum. The CSIP plan is shared at an open SBDM meeting so all stakeholders have an opportunity to provide input before council approval. The CSIP strategies are implemented and monitored for effectiveness. Implementation and impact checks are conducted several times throughout the year to monitor effectiveness. The SBDM council also reviews student academic progress at open meetings regularly.

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.)*

A copy of our school's professional development plan is attached. In addition to the school PD plan, we also created a 30-60-90 day plan to target our TSI status for Hispanic students. The focus of our work in this plan was around Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning.
## ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden Spring Elementary PD Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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).

Increase the reading proficiency percentage for all accountable Hispanic students from 28% in 2018 - 2019 to 43% in 2021 – 2022 as measured by KPREP assessment results. This will be a 5% increase in proficiency each year for our Hispanic students on the reading portion of the KPREP assessment. Increase the math proficiency percentage for all accountable Hispanic students from 41.8% in 2018 - 2019 to 56.8% in 2021 – 2022 as measured by KPREP assessment results. This will be a 5% increase in proficiency each year for our Hispanic students on the math portion of the KPREP assessment.

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.

Our Closing the Achievement Gap Summary is attached.
### Attachment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Associated Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![folder] Closing the Achievement Gap Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![file] Garden Spring Elementary PD Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>• II.G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![folder] GSE Achievement Gap Group Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>• I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019-20 Phase Two: School Assurances

Garden Springs Elementary School
Joey Sheroan
2151 Garden Springs Dr
Lexington, Kentucky, 40504
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/24/2019
Status: Locked
Teacher Performance

1. The Every Study 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.
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.
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.
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
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
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
Garden Springs Elementary

Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

2019 - 2020
### 1: Proficiency Goal

**Goal 1:** Increase the averaged combined reading and math proficiency score from 59.95% in 2018 – 2019 to 67.2% in 2022 – 2023.

**Goal Breakdown by Reading and Math**

Increase reading KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 59.7% in 2018 – 2019 to 67% in 2022 – 2023.

Increase math KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 60.2% in 2018 – 2019 to 67.4% in 2022 – 2023.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Activities to deploy strategy</th>
<th>Measure of Success</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring Date &amp; Notes</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objective 1: Increase the reading KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 59.7% in 2018 – 2019 to 61.5% by May 2020. | Continue to develop a systematic approach for the design and deployment of standards in order to ensure that all students are being taught the standards at appropriate levels of rigor. | Ensure the following occur during the PLC planning process at PLC meetings, faculty meetings, and at long range planning meetings:  
- review the alignment between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures  
- ensure tasks are grade appropriate  
- ensure assessment measures cover all standards and meet the individual needs of students | Teaching teams will complete unit plans at PLC meetings. Teachers also will evaluate, analyze, and discuss the effectiveness of lesson implementation at PLC meetings.  
Teachers will submit lesson plans to administration weekly; and administrators will monitor lesson plan submission. | Lesson plans are created at PLC meetings each week and are uploaded into the Google Drive for administration to monitor regularly.  
Administration monitors instruction daily through walkthroughs and PGES evaluations.  
Student assessment data is monitored regularly to determine student progress. | No funding needed |

*Must grow by 1.8% this year to reach objective.

Objective 2: Increase the math KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 60.2% in 2018 – 2019 to 62% by May 2020.

Continue to develop a systematic approach to design and deliver instruction to ensure all students have access during Tier I to highly effective, culturally responsive, evidenced based core instruction.

Administrators will monitor instruction through daily walkthroughs and PGES evaluations.

Teachers will analyze and evaluate data using data monitoring protocols during PLC meetings.
| Conduct cyclical curriculum reviews/checks | Review formative and summative data to determine support or acceleration opportunities for students | Review walkthrough data and formal observation data to measure progress and identify areas for improvement | Plus/deltas and survey data will be reviewed to determine effectiveness of professional learning. |

The school administrative team will identify ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies for teachers to participate in to improve ELA instruction.

The school administrative team will identify ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies for teachers to participate in to improve math instruction.
2: Separate Academic Indicator Goal

Goal 2: Increase the averaged combined science, social studies, and on-demand writing proficiency score from 53.97% in 2018 – 2019 to 62.37% in 2022 – 2023.

Goal Breakdown by Science, Social Studies, and On-demand Writing

Increase science KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 34.2% in 2018 – 2019 to 46.2% in 2022 – 2023.

Increase social studies KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 71.1% in 2018 – 2019 to 76.4% in 2022 – 2023.

Increase on-demand writing KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 56.6% in 2018 – 2019 to 64.5% in 2022 – 2023.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Activities to deploy strategy</th>
<th>Measure of Success</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring Date &amp; Notes</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: Increase the science KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 34.2% in 2018 – 2019 to 37.2% by May 2020.</td>
<td>Continue to develop a systematic approach to design and deliver instruction to ensure all students have access during Tier I to highly effective, culturally responsive, evidenced based core instruction in science.</td>
<td>The school administrative team will identify ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies for teachers to participate in around the implementation of our Amplify science program.</td>
<td>Plus/deltas and survey data will be reviewed to determine effectiveness of professional learning.</td>
<td>Professional learning opportunities are evaluated by teachers and administrators.</td>
<td>No funding needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: Increase the social studies KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 71.1% in 2018 – 2019 to 72.4% by May 2020.</td>
<td>Continue to develop a systematic approach to design and deliver instruction to ensure all students have access during Tier I to highly effective, culturally responsive, evidenced based core instruction in writing.</td>
<td>The school administrative team will identify ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies for teachers to participate in around the implementation of our school-wide writing program. Teachers will implement all components of the writing plan, student work will be analyzed throughout the year, and revisions will be made to the writing plan to promote improved student achievement in writing.</td>
<td>Plus/deltas and survey data will be reviewed to determine effectiveness of professional learning.</td>
<td>During PLC meetings and at faculty meetings, teachers will analyze student writing to determine next steps with student writing and adjustments that are needed to the writing plan.</td>
<td>No funding needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: Increase the on-demand writing KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage from 56.6% in 2018 – 2019 to 64.5% in 2022 – 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers have analyzed student writing and next steps have been developed.</td>
<td>No funding needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2018 – 2019 to 58.6% by May 2020.**

*Must grow by 2% this year to reach objective.

---

### 3: Achievement Gap Goal

Goal 3: Increase reading KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage for Hispanic students from 27.9% in 2018 – 2019 to 41.0% in 2022 – 2023.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Activities to deploy strategy</th>
<th>Measure of Success</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring Date &amp; Notes</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: Increase the reading KPREP Assessment proficiency percentage for accountable Hispanic students from 27.9% in 2018 – 2019 to 31.2% by May 2020.</td>
<td>Develop a systematic approach to design and deliver instruction to ensure our Hispanic students are successful in reading.</td>
<td>Teachers will participate in ongoing Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning training during PLC meetings and at our regular faculty meetings to ensure best practice/high yield strategies are being implemented with our Hispanic students.</td>
<td>Through daily walkthroughs and PGES evaluations, administrators will monitor instruction, specifically the implementation of Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning strategies.</td>
<td>Professional learning opportunities are evaluated by teachers and administrators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4: Growth Goal

**Goal 4:**
By May 2021, we will increase the growth indicator score on the state assessment from 63.7 to 69.

This is a 5.3 point increase over two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Activities to deploy strategy</th>
<th>Measure of Success</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1:</td>
<td>By May 2020, we will increase the Garden Springs Elementary school students’ reading growth indicator score from 61.5 to 64.15. *Must increase by 2.65</td>
<td>Develop a systematic approach to design and deliver instruction to ensure students scoring below the 40\textsuperscript{th} percentile on the MAP math assessment receive needed support to continuously improve their math achievement. Ensure assessment item analysis methods are occurring within PLCs to evaluate instructional effectiveness and determine if instructional adjustments are needed. Develop a clearly defined MTSS process with applicable checklist(s) and documentation tools, including such information as service frequency, intervention programs/strategies, and progress monitoring checks.</td>
<td>Monitor assessment data during PLC meetings to ensure completion Evaluate systems to determine effectiveness</td>
<td>Formative and summative data is analyzed regularly at PLC meetings and instructional adjustments are made based on data. The MTSS team meets monthly to review student progress, analyze the effectiveness of</td>
<td>No funding needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2:</td>
<td>Develop a systematic approach to design and deliver instruction to ensure students scoring below the 40th percentile on the MAP reading assessment receive needed support to continuously improve their reading achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>interventions, and develop next steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By May 2020, we will increase Garden Springs Elementary school students’ math growth indicator scores from 65.9 to 68.55. *Must increase by 2.65</td>
<td>Continue to develop a systematic approach to design and deliver instruction to ensure all students have access during Tier I to highly effective, culturally responsive, evidenced based core instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>