OVT Chair Annual Summary Report

Organization:	D0469
Rating in spring:	2023
OVT Chair:	Beth Clavenna-Deane

Year 2

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.

Lansing reported that they are within compliance in all compliance related areas. One improvement from last year was compliance within the CTE pathways. The counselors, CTE instructors, and the Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning have worked over the course of the last 18th months to create compliance within the pathways they have as well as eliminate, improve, and create courses that provide alignment within the pathways. Additionally, the Early Childhood compliance areas made significant improvements. While last year they were in compliance for Child Find and providing services that met the guidelines under IDEA, they set a course to align their work within an MTSS structure. As a result, they created a building leadership team; administered a universal screener in fall, winter, and spring; and used the screening data to inform their core instruction for early literacy and numeracy. Their results were positive with a decreased number of students needing Tier 3 support as a result.

In terms of foundational structures, there were some updates to these structures from Year 1 in MTSS and Post-Secondary Readiness. The district as a whole moved from MTSS Structuring to MTSS Implementation. The district implemented both a district-wide universal screening system and a district-wide core math curriculum. With both of these new structures, the building teams were able to analyze their data and work with PLCs to improve instruction in classrooms. They completed 5 days of Implementation training with Kansas MTSS State Trainers and are now moving into their sustainability year. They will still receive support from Kansas MTSS through the sustainability year, and they will receive some targeted support for behavioral and social emotional interventions in the fall.

For Post-Secondary Readiness, the district has two buildings implementing some structures that will impact students being ready for life after high school. Lansing Middle School implemented a new procedure to empower students to review, analyze, and improve their grades through a program they called GBA - Grades, Behavior, and Attendance. With this program, teachers in study hall set up conversations with students on Mondays to look at the students' GBA and the students set goals for improvement. The middle school feels this program will help students become more organized and feel more invested in their work. Lansing High School implemented more aligned and engaging courses within their CTE pathways and added three new pathways this year to efficiently and adequately prepare students for future careers.

Section B: Summarize the progress of GOAL #1 after two years in cycle. Provide specific detail to include strategies employed, challenges expected or incurred and professional learning conducted to support the particular priorities being targeted by the system and schools that positively impact the state board outcomes. Be sure to include supporting evidence in your narrative. Refer to Year Two: Goal and Action Plan Development Goal Area 1 in the KESA Workbook.

Lansing has selected Relevance as their first goal area. Specifically, their goal addressed writing local curriculum and adopting a resource. This year the focus was zeroed in on two realms: implementing MTSS with a new Math core resource, new assessment system, and full MTSS structure in every building; Writing local curriculum and piloting resources for adoption in 6-12 ELA, 6-12 World Language, K-12 Music (instrumental and vocal), and K-12 Art.

Their screening data in the elementary and middle school showed improvement in math fall to spring; their data in the high school showed improvement in math fall to winter with a slight dip back in the spring. The Intermediate school did not show growth fall to winter or fall to spring; as a result they are looking specifically at pieces within their system to address fidelity and consistency with delivery of math content. They intend to see growth in Year 3 as a result.

The district was able to successfully analyze the data using their Kansas MTSS Framework to determine that fidelity to the using the core resource for Math was occurring across most grade levels and buildings. Each building indicated that further depth and professional development on using all the robust components of the math core is still necessary for Years 3 and 4. Additionally, they also are looking at successful, evidence-based math intervention curriculum for adoption in Years 3 and 4.

Finally, their reading and ELA data has shown regression on the screener and in state assessments across the district over the course of the past four years of trend data. As a result, the ELA curriculum for K-5 will be the next top priority and will be written over the summer of 2019 with a pilot of new resources occurring in the Year 3 cycle. A decision of which to adopt and a look at preliminary results will occur at the Year 3 OVT.

The OVT will be looking for evidence on the following areas related to Relevance: Was the math core resource taught with fidelity as evidenced by fall to spring screener data? Was the pilot for the ELA resource K-5 completed with fidelity and did the one chosen have an impact on improving students' ability to read based on fall to spring screener data? Finally, did the state assessment scores in 2019 and 2020 show growth in Math as was evidenced by spring 2019 screener data? The focus on curriculum writing and adoption should relate directly to improved state assessments and screener data if the adopted resource is evidence-based, taught with fidelity, and MTSS practices are conducted with fidelity.   Evidence related to these questions will be sought by the OVT.

Section C: Summarize the progress of GOAL #2 after two years in cycle. Provide specific detail to include strategies employed, challenges expected or incurred and professional learning conducted to support the particular priorities being targeted by the system and schools that positively impact the state board outcomes. Be sure to include supporting evidence in your narrative. Refer to Year Two: Goal and Action Plan Development Goal Area 1 in the KESA Workbook.

Lansing has selected RIGOR as their second goal specifically to focus on professional development. Their goal was to adopt the Kansas Professional Learning Standards and to analyze data to increase student learning. Each building has developed building leadership teams and learning communities. The focus of their professional development this year has been tied to the adoption of their new math curriculum. Teams presented that they are using professional development to enhance knowledge of the math curriculum and resources so that the curriculum can be implemented with fidelity. Stakeholders from each building reported that this is the first time in which they feel that professional development is focused and meaningful.

The second area of Goal 2 is having a focus on data to increase student learning. Lansing has an abundance of data that was shared with the team. This data shows that with an intentional focus on math and training on new math materials that student achievement is on a upward trend. Much of their data at this time is baseline and will be reviewed more in depth in year 3. They also use data to make determination on tier placement within the MTSS process.

Lansing is working with TASN and has a focused professional development plan for the next 3 years. All buildings are now aligned with the district goals. It is apparent that Lansing has a clear and concise plan to address professional development which in turn has an impact upon student achievement.

The OVT recommends that Lansing continue to interpret both IMIS/MTSS data and their participant feedback data to determine a clear and aligned professional development plan for the district for Year 3.

Section D: Describe any applicable plan for supporting "outlier" schools in the system. Provide a brief narrative detailing the contributions of stakeholders at the building level to system improvement.

Lansing has made strides in utilizing stakeholders for decision making. The district has both a district site council and a district leadership team. It became evident that each building needed to include internal stakeholders on building leadership teams so that all decision making committees were included. All buildings found that they needed to add a professional development council member to the team. The district leadership team reviews programs and plans with a systems approach. Every building is represented on the district leadership team. In year 1 and year 2, all buildings presented as individual stakeholder groups. It was noticeable in Year 2 that many of the growth statements and evidence were similar across the buildings. However, because only the building was presenting, the other buildings were unaware of these stark similarities. These similarities are positive indications that their system within MTSS is being implemented. Therefore, in Year 3, the DLT, which as stated above represents every building, can provide both information on the district's growth and information on each building's growth. This will allow both the OVT to see the system communication in action as well as for each building to see first hand the growth the district's system is having since all buildings are moving in the same direction.

The district site council is comprised of members from each building site council as well as additional patrons. Lansing uses a self correcting feedback loop so that information flows up and down seamlessly.   However, site councils are not being utilized as much as they could be. At this time they are given information rather than engaging in the conversations. This was addressed and they will begin with utilizing a parent committee, district leadership team, and site councils, to help determine how to communicate Fast Bridge information to parents so that the process is consistent and the data is delivered in the same manner.

It is evident that the district leadership team which includes internal stakeholders is responsible for making decisions at the systems level and that the "big picture" is seen by all buildings. This is something that Lansing is proud of using and it has given purpose to PreK-12 decisions so that each building is not making individual decisions that are not tied to one another.

The OVT recommends that for next year that the district leadership team be the only district-level stakeholder group to present and discuss the improvement the system makes. Furthermore, the OVT recommends that the district site council present again to see growth in the areas the site council noted as areas for improvement (see above).

Section E: Discuss baseline data results following the year 1 needs assessment that will validate the quality of system improvement over time. The OVT will review this data annually and The Accreditation Review Council will be considering this quantitative data in chart and/or narrative form in year 5. Examples are, but not limited to: attendance, behavior, assessment and state board outcomes.

Lansing USD 469 chose two overall district goals, one for building a local curriculum in all areas of instruction and the second for creating systematic professional development that enhances the instructional practices and curricular decisions the district has made. Lansing has embarked, starting in Year 1, on creating a multi-tiered system of supports. This district-wide improvement system has guided much of the decision making occurring regarding curriculum and professional development. Year 2, current KESA year, has been the initial implementation year for MTSS and for KESA. The results for year 2 are described through screener growth data as well as progress in the systems pieces of MTSS. As well, they will be providing state assessment data and data regarding the state board outcomes as the years of KESA progress.

This KESA year they implemented a math curriculum that they wrote and piloted last year. Their winter screener data showed growth in math from the fall, which preliminarily indicated that teachers were teaching the core resource with fidelity. Spring data for some buildings continued to show growth for math (see Relevance report in Section B for more details). There were various other curricular areas that were mapped and implemented this year such as visual arts and music and social studies. However, math was the data they specifically highlighted.

Finally, Early Childhood implemented a screener and a new core curriculum this year with significant results fall to spring that were compiled. Early Childhood had not previously had goals, and after the year 1 OVT they compiled a BLT, collaborative teams, and drew up goals that matched the district's goals.

Additionally, their instructional staff completed the Inclusive MTSS Implementation Scale to evaluate the implementation of their overall system. This is the baseline year of that systems fidelity measure. It shows overall that the district is strong in administrative support of the process; initial collaboration and data-based decision making at the team level; and using a district-wide assessment system to screen, progress monitor, and inform instruction. However, it does show areas for improvement in fidelity to core instruction in reading and behavior/SEL; use of intervention resources for all areas; and communication with staff on solid instructional practices that enhance and improve the delivery of the core and intervention curriculum across all areas.

It is recommended that the district focus efforts next year on implementing their ELA core 6-8 as well as their pilot K-5 with high fidelity. Fidelity measure data will be requested to determine if the core was taught with fidelity. Furthermore, it is highly recommended that the district use walk-through data to support instructional coaching and instructional practices that support fidelity to the core in Math, ELA, as well as other core curricular areas such as science and social studies. Additionally, walk-through data should be used to see if interventions are being delivered with fidelity to the resource as well as the MTSS practices.

With regards to their second district-wide goal: Professional Development, the data presented was primarily staff perception data and type of professional development that was planned and delivered. Two notable pieces of data emerged from this conversation: 1) The perception data from each day of PD on the math resource indicated areas that were planned for in the next training day of PD for the math resource. The perception survey served as formative assessment to inform the Professional Development Council and District Leadership Team as to what was learned and what continues to need to be learned. 2) Because the professional development was either based on perception data after each PD day or targeted to address the phases of MTSS, the staffs' responses indicated that the PD was exceptionally meaningful. Every teacher as a result of implementing MTSS, feels very invested and able to apply what they learned. The statement was made that "everyone wanted to be there so they didn't find other things to do on PD days, which happened a lot in the past. PD has finally become meaningful."

It is recommended for next year that they continue to connect their PD to the data they collect in MTSS, both screener student-level data and IMIS systems-level data. The more formative they can be in their approach to professional learning, the greater chance they have of maintaining participation and relevance at the level they achieved this year.