OVT Chair Annual Summary Report

Organization:	D0469
Rating in spring:	2022
OVT Chair:	Beth Clavenna-Deane

Year 3

Section A: Review the current condition of Compliance and Foundational Structures. Provide a concise summarization to include specific areas of Compliance and Foundational Structures relative to the discussion at each of the previous OVT visits. Refer to the KESA Workbook for lists, descriptions or definitions.

In Years 1 and 2, the conversation regarding CTE compliance came up regularly. The district has worked with a sub-group team to rebuild compliance with CTE pathways alignment with course offerings. In the Year 3 district summary, the statement was made that CTE alignment has improved. Additionally in the district summary a list was provided that identified all the CTE areas and how the courses are now aligned. All other compliance areas are in full compliance with state mandated program requirements.

All listed foundational structures identified continued growth or maintenance of already achieved growth. Specific mention is given towards the continued growth in MTSS, which aligns with the academic data noted in the results section D. As well, mental health and post-secondary and career preparation showed growth from last year to this year, and these also align with board goal results for social emotional growth and post-secondary engagement. Furthermore, growth in professional learning related to diversity and equity was identified with a focus on learning in this area for all staff and continued growth over years 4 and 5.

As the district moves into Years 4 and 5, it will be important to articulate the growth in each of these foundational structures to ensure that continuous improvement is occurring.

Section B: Describe how the system will monitor the progress of the identified priorities of GOAL #1. A quality paragraph will provide indicators of improvement, evidence of effective communication and professional learning for this goal area.

Specific examples will support the goal statement and goal priorities being targeted that positively impact students and state board outcomes. Be sure to include supporting evidence in your narrative. Details can be found in authenticated applications on the Goals pages of the Yearly System Updates for years 2 and 3.

RELEVANCE has been chosen as Goal 1 for Lansing. Their primary focus for relevance is alignment of their curriculum and resources to the standards and vertically across grade levels. Lansing has placed a concerted long-term effort on building a solid local curriculum. In their summary, they emphasize that the initial Year 1 focus was on mapping the standards. In year 2, math and various specials and electives were the focus for adoption of resources and implementation. In year 3, they focused on secondary ELA and science of which alignment of standards has occurred and adoption and implementation of resources has occurred as well. As they are enter into year 4, they are going to focus on elementary ELA. They piloted three ELA resources in K-5 this year and have begun the process of identifying which core had the most impact on reading, writing, and overall student learning. As a result of this discussion, they will adopt an ELA core for K-5 that will be implemented across the elementary schools next school year.

Prior to 2017, mapping of the standards had not occurred in ten years. As well, alignment of resources vertically with consistent language, procedures, and application had not been a norm. Much like the need to align all buildings into a system, the curriculum needed a similar alignment. Evidence that could lead to determining if fidelity is occurring would come from the FASTbridge screening data fall to winter to spring of each of the two years. Math Fastbridge data from fall to spring of 2018-19 school year indicated that math scores improved in 5 of the K-10 grade levels that were assessed. This was the resource adopted and implemented in that school year. In the 2019-20 school year, however, only 4 of the K-10 grade levels made improvement from fall to winter (spring was not collected due to COVID 19). The year of adoption indicated that fidelity to the resource and to the procedures within MTSS were occurring in almost half of the grade levels. With the drop in the following year, it is recommended for the district to evaluate how they will monitor fidelity to the resource and to its accompanying instructional practices. K-5 Reading Fastbridge data in Year 2 (2018-19) from fall to winter to spring indicated vastly different results grade level to grade level, which is evident of inconsistency with fidelity to the core resource and instructional practices. This was the year prior to the pilot year of three evidence-based practice resources. In the year of the pilot (2019-20), 5 of the 6 K-5 grade levels either maintained their fall percent at benchmark or made improvements from fall to winter. This was also the year of implementation of a new ELA resource for 6-12. The scores fall to winter for 6-12 indicated that 5 of the 6 grade levels either made growth or stayed within the target (80% or more of students at or above benchmark) from fall to winter.

The OVT recommends that further systems are created and used to continue monitoring fidelity to core resources. With this fidelity monitoring, the chance for K-12 ELA to stay on course and not dip like Math did is greater. This will also help bring math back up to where they were in their initial implementation of the resource year.

Other areas (music, drama, art, science, etc.) have been adopted as well, however, there isn't screening data to suggest whether those resources are being used with fidelity or making an impact on the area of need.

Section C: Describe how the system will monitor the progress of the identified priorities of GOAL #2. A quality paragraph will provide indicators of improvement, evidence of effective communication and professional learning for this goal area.

Specific examples will support the goal statement and goal priorities being targeted that positively impact students and state board outcomes. Be sure to include supporting evidence in your narrative. Details can be found in authenticated applications on the Goals pages of the Yearly System Updates for years 2 and 3.

Lansing has selected RIGOR as it relates to Professional Development for their second goal. They have made huge strides in this area since beginning this process. The Professional Development Committee has taken a key role in designing professional development that is needed for the system and tailored it to each building. Prior to this year, each building was operating with its own agenda. There was not buy-in from all buildings to focus as a SYSTEM. Building leadership teams and a district leadership team were formed, and it has improved the process greatly. Communication and planning is directed toward a common goal.

While there is not a good way to collect quantifiable data, we have discussed with the system about ways to look for this and improve on it in future cycles. They will begin a new collaboration with a professional learning network and with that a needs assessment will be used providing data that may supply them with the quantifiable numbers needed to show improvement.

Clear and detailed goals and guidelines for professional development have been created and data on student achievement is being collected. Fidelity to the core instruction is a key indicator in their plan, and they are collecting data with the Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale (IMIS). The data collected from 474 staff members across two years show that the majority of the staff feels (agree to strongly agree) that they have what they need, that the administration supports them, and that students are being served in all areas. While the IMIS does not specifically measure PD, it is showing that as a district who is working with TASN, they are making a difference in Tiers 1, 2, and 3. As well, one area for improvement noted through the IMIS data that does impact professional development is the Empowering Culture and Leadership section. These questions specifically get at how to function as data-based decision making teams who are Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). These questions from the previous year to this year had some noted regression which could potentially indicate that the teams need assistance with collaboration and decision making as a cohesive unit. Some of the professional learning network collaboration that Lansing is undertaking for the next accreditation year is focused on how professional learning communities function.

The OVT has been impressed with the work that has occurred over the last 2 cycles in bringing the buildings together to function as a system while meeting individual school needs. While this is not quantifiable, it has been obvious to the team as we have worked with the system. One anecdotal example of this has been the vertical alignment conversations that have occurred after each FASTBridge screening period. All five buildings (prek-12) have shared their data for reading, math, and behavior with the other buildings, provided feedback to each of the other buildings on what the data is suggesting, and worked together on how to align instructional practices and language so that the district has a united effort with regards to MTSS. These three screening period conversations occur during Professional Development days.

It is recommended that the system find a way to collect meaningful data to show if the professional development is being delivered and used in accordance with their RIGOR KESA goal.

Section D: Summarize the results data discussed and displayed in this section that will validate the quality of system improvement over time. The Accreditation Review Council will be considering quantitative data in chart and/or narrative form. Examples are, but not limited to: attendance, behavior, assessment and state board outcomes.

Lansing selected Curriculum as their first KESA goal and Professional Development as their second KESA goal. Their effort in curriculum and fidelity is working well for academics, specifically with regards to their reading and math screening data. They have multiple grade levels that are showing growth from winter to winter across two years. It is important to look at screening data in multiple ways. Looking at screening data from one winter benchmarking time to the next provides context to curricular decisions as well as instructional practices because the constant one year to the next is the teacher and the resources. Starting with Pre-k and Early Childhood, they adopted and implemented a new comprehensive core curriculum resource in the 2018-19 school year; this group's data indicated significant growth winter to winter in phonological awareness, oral language, and number core with 27%, 33%, and 17% respectively of students at Tier 1 in winter of 2018-19 and 35%, 56%, and 25% of students in Tier 1 in winter 2019-20. After piloting three K-5 reading curricula this past school year, their screening data also indicated consistent growth over last year's winter screening data for grades K-5, additionally, 6th 9th, and 10th showed nice growth in their winter screening data. 6-8 and 9-12 adopted new core reading/ELA resources this past year. Some of the lack of growth in middle school and high school may be attributed to fidelity to the core or whether the resource focuses well on the components of reading necessary at these grade levels. As for Math, Lansing had nice growth in the 2018-19 year in Math screening data; that was the first year of implementation of their new math curriculum resource K-12. However, this year, the winter screening data in comparison to the previous winter's screening data had less consistent growth than reading with only K, 3, and 5 showing growth in the elementary, 6th and 7th in the middle, and 10th in the high school.   The recommendation is for the district to continue to work on fidelity of Pre-K instruction, fidelity of reading instruction once the reading core resource is chosen for K-5 to amplify the momentum with reading that was achieved in this school year, fidelity of core instruction for ELA in middle and high school, and fidelity to math instruction to bring the growth next winter back up for all grade levels.

With regards to state assessment data though, their math data from 2017 to 2019 (2020 was not collected due to COVID 19) was stagnant with an average of 35% of students in Levels 3 or 4 in 2017 (range 24%-51%) and an average of 35% still in Levels 3 and 4 in 2019 (range 21%-44%). For ELA, the trend of stagnation continued with an average of 42% in 2017 (range 32%-57%) and an average of 43% in 2019 (range 36% -54%). Furthermore, the largest number of students in Level 1 on the state assessment in reading and math are students with disabilities and conversely the smallest number of students in Levels 3 and 4 are students with disabilities. Lansing has set a goal internally to meet ESSA's recommendation of 75% of students being at Levels 3 and 4 (college and career ready) in math and reading by 2025. In 2019, they had 1 grade level on target for meeting that goal in ELA and 2 grade levels on target for meeting that goal in Math. Fidelity to their local curriculum to the curricular resources' scope and sequence, and to increasing students with disabilities in the core setting with scaffolding and differentiation is recommended to ensure that more students are achieving Level 3 and 4 on the state assessment in math and reading.

With regards to behavior data which is analyzed in the outcomes areas of attendance, office referrals, and course grade data, attendance has made improvements from 2018-19 school year to the 2019-20 school year in all grades. Office referrals improved in most grades with each building having at least one grade level that had a dip in the winter. Attendance averaged above 90% of students attending 90% of the time or better; Office referrals averaged above the 90% of students having 0-1 referral in the course of a quarter or semester. Course grade data however is the weakest area in the social emotional data. Starting in 5th grade, course grade data had an average of 81% of students passing all classes in 2018-19 with a range of 58% to 93%. In 2019-20, the course grade data had an average of 89% with a range of 74% to 98%. Notably, though there was significant growth made in the number of students passing courses.

In terms of the number of students being identified as at-risk for behavioral and social emotional concerns, the SAEBRS screener is used. On average, in 2018-19 86% of students were identified as not at-risk; in 2019-20, 89% of students were identified as not at-risk. Within the Social Emotional Learning Growth Measured Locally section of the board goals, the Communities that Care Survey data was identified as a growth measure. It will be beneficial next year to have this data over the four years of the KESA cycle to determine growth from the student voice as a stakeholder.

Behavior and Social Emotional Learning is the area they are continuing to implement for MTSS moving into Year 3, and they are looking at adopting consistent resources for teaching social emotional learning Pre-K-12. The Prek and two elementary buildings have Second Step and the High School has implemented two competencies from the College and Career Competency Framework (CCCF). However, the middle school hasn't adopted any SEL curricula yet. They have been considering Second Step. They would be encouraged to do that. Within the CCCF and Second Step, there are formative assessments and summative assessments. These measures coupled with the Communities that Care data identified above will be a robust set of data to show growth in the Social Emotional Learning area.

Finally, in terms of the Graduation rate and the Post-secondary effectiveness rate which are both impacted by the Goal area 1 - Curriculum, the graduation rate for the high school/district has dropped in the past two years from 97% in 2017 to 94.5% in 2019. This could be impacted by the weak course grade data. Post-secondary completion rate has not been reported at the state level since Year 1. At that point in 2017, the effective rate had grown incrementally each year since 2013. A recommendation in the behavior, social emotional learning, and graduation data would be to focus on course grade data improvement. Specifically, an emphasis on why are course grades so variant and what could be a consistent method for grading achievement is recommended.

As for Goal 2, Lansing chose professional development. The IMIS data provides an outline of what professional development (PD) is needed in the district. The IMIS indicated PD has had an impact in all 20 indicators for reading when comparing last year's IMIS data results to this year's IMIS data results. This lined up nicely with the FASTbridge reading data, which indicated consistent growth for K-6. The district's belief in MTSS and Alignment has improved in the system as well, specifically at the teacher level related to data-based decision making and that MTSS is working. The IMIS also aligned with the FASTbridge data for Math. 16 out of 29 indicators had growth in Math from last year to this year. There were a few indicators that showed phenomenal growth across reading and math, most notably including all students in core instruction improved from 75% of staff indicating that this is occurring last year to 90% of staff indicating that this is occurring this year. Unfortunately, state assessments couldn't be given this year to see if the impact of more students with disabilities in the core would have reduced the Level 1 numbers.

From the IMIS, a recommended focal point for this upcoming year would be Empowering Culture and Leadership as it r

Section E: Summarize the implementation of building level and system level action plans, review data and evidence supporting plans and selected goals. Evidence of a shared responsibility and the necessary resources provided to buildings are to be identified.

This cycle we have seen evidence of change from working as individual building systems to working as a district level system. Their establishment of Building Leadership Teams with representation on the District Leadership Team and their establishment of protocols for decision making flowing bi-directionally between these two sets of teams has occurred for curriculum resource decisions and for district-wide professional development decisions. Furthermore, they have met regularly as these teams to dig into screener data and use it to inform next steps as a team.

They have an abundance of data they have collected and organized for review. They are working with TASN to sustain their MTSS, and as a result are monitoring the fidelity of their core and interventions for reading, math, social emotional learning, and behavior. A walk through tool has been used in the past to monitor this fidelity across buildings and analyzed by district administration. Staff feedback on the use of the walk through tool to inform and improve their instruction has been positive, however, the use of the tool incurred some technical difficulties in the late fall and did not resurge with use after that. It is recommended that this tool be consistently used and inform discussions the PLCs are having as well as the BLT and DLT in terms of what practices are being used widely and what practices may need some further professional learning.

One notable piece of data that addresses the system and how it is working as a whole is the IMIS data. When comparing this year to last year on the BLT section of empowering culture and leadership, it would indicate that the BLT members who completed the IMIS are not feeling that communication is occurring well to and from the DLT or PLCs. Nor do they feel that the BLT meetings are functioning well or addressing data-based decision making in the way they expect the team to function. In the district's summary, they acknowledge that this area of the self-correcting feedback loop needs further improvement. Upon the OVT recommendations, Lansing district administration created some initial actionable steps for how this would look. Their focus right now is on bi-directional communication of actions that each type of team would identify (e.g. BLTs sharing notes and next steps with the DLT and PLCs). This will initially develop communication between teams.

Since the BLTs and PLCs identified that functioning within the teams is not at the level of expectation, the OVT also recommends professional learning around the structure and function of a teams (such as developing trust, productive struggle within teams, and norms for problem solving that lead to collective efficacy).   With PD on the structure of PLCs occurring through a professional learning network next year, they will likely receive some of these actionable steps for communication and decision making. This would be a great place to expand those steps to the BLT and DLT so that team-focused decision making can occur with collective efficacy.

Finally, in terms of engaging stakeholders and sharing responsibility with them, the FES data indicated that families are feeling engaged and communicated with. They rated sharing power and advocacy at an average of 3.89 out of 5, which is a marked improvement over the previous two years which had an average of 3.3 and 3.4 respectively.

Section F: In this section, the OVT Chair will include additional evidence of system improvement observed during this cycle that may be more about a quality, sustainable improvement process. Included are, but not limited to: established policies, procedures and regulations designed to sustain effective and efficient roles for employees, non-employee stakeholders and system leadership at all levels. Be sure and include how this system has made gains in supporting the overall Kansas Vision for Education and the state board outcomes. Describe how this system is/is not adequately prepared to begin the final year of the accreditation cycle.

As indicated in Sections D and E, system improvements have occurred as evidenced by the IMIS data and the FES data. To address the team-focused decision making areas for improvement, Lansing has been able to establish a late start for the elementary buildings and the high school buildings to ensure that time for PLCs can occur. That coupled with professional learning on the structure of PLCs and collective efficacy, will provide momentum next year for systems level growth.

In terms of state assessment growth, social emotional growth, and post-secondary completion growth, focusing on fidelity in their MTSS as well as completion of adoption of resources will begin to shift these systems outcomes. For state assessment, fidelity to core resources and making sure all students are included in the core environment with solid differentiation and scaffolding occurring in those core settings will assist with moving students with disabilities from Level 1 to Levels 2 and 3 at a much higher rate. Currently, the largest number of students in Level 1 on the state assessment in reading and math are students with disabilities and conversely the smallest number of students in Levels 3 and 4 are students with disabilities. So a heavy focus on bridging the gaps for these students and increasing their participation in the grade level core instruction setting will boost their achievement.

For social emotional growth, a focus on course grades for the district would be advantageous. This particular data in comparison to the SAEBRS, attendance, and office referral data is the outlier. Additionally, using formative and summative assessments within the SEL curricula to show growth and comparing year to year responses on the CTC survey will provide adequate measures to set goals from and determine growth.

Possibly as a result of the course grade variances, the graduation rate for the high school/district has dropped in the past two years from 97% in 2017 to 94.5% in 2019. An emphasis on why are course grades so variant and what could be a consistent method for grading achievement is recommended.

Post-secondary completion rate has not been reported since Year 1. At that point in 2017, the effective rate had grown incrementally each year since 2013. At the OVT meeting next year, it will be beneficial to analyze the growth from 2017-2018 as that would mirror the longitudinal data identified in this section as a whole.

Policies, procedures, and efforts have been established to garner stakeholder feedback in multiple decisions for this district's accreditation efforts. District Site Council meets regularly to discuss the goals and any feedback needed from the community on the district's initiatives and community engagement.