



2020-21 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap  
Diagnostic\_01122021\_16:06

2020-21 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic

**Junction City Elementary School**  
**Pamela Shunk**  
250 School Street  
Junction City, Kentucky, 40440  
United States of America

---

## Table of Contents

2020-21 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic	3
I. Achievement Gap Group Identification	4
II. Achievement Gap Analysis	5
III. Planning the Work	8
Attachment Summary	9

## 2020-21 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.

It is attached.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

#### **Attachment Name**

---



JCES Achievement Gap Groups

## II. Achievement Gap Analysis

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

In the spring, our staff creates a master schedule for the upcoming school year that is centered around our special education population. Our service delivery model is primarily collaborative and our special education students are in the regular classroom for the majority of the day, unless a student's IEP dictates otherwise. At each grade level, K-5, we flexibly group our students and allocate our support staff to the classrooms with the neediest students. As part of our Leader in Me program, all students set individual goals each semester and work with their teachers to create individual plans in order to help them achieve their goals. Students routinely reflect on their goals and discuss their progress with their teachers. We have individual, class, and school-wide incentives in place to celebrate when goals are met. In addition, there are several supports in place for our low-income students, including, but not limited to, the following: FRC programs, the free/reduced meal program (CEP program), clothing and school supply assistance, etc.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

#### **Attachment Name**

---

 Master Schedule 2020-21


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

Our 2018-19 results showed no gap between our F/R and non-F/R lunch students in science.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

#### **Attachment Name**

---

 School Report Card

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 school has made inconsistent progress in closing the gap between F/R students and non-F/R lunch students, as indicated by 2018-19 K-Prep results. We closed the gap in reading a bit more with a 13.2% difference between the percentage of F/R students reaching proficiency (73.3%) as compared to the percentage of non F/R lunch students (86.5%). This was approximately 6% better than the previous year.

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.

In math, the gap between our F/R and non-F/R lunch students increased from a 23.5% difference in 2017-18 to a 31.6% difference in 2018-19. In addition, gaps still persist in reading, math, and science between students with identified disabilities and those without. In fact, the gaps in reading and math increased from 2017-18 to 2018-19. In reading, the gap increased from 11.5% in 2017-18 to 17.1% in 2018-19. In math, the gap increased from 10.2% in 2017-18 to 23.9% in 2018-19. In addition, there was a lower percentage of students with disabilities reaching proficiency in reading and math than did so the previous year.

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

Our collaboration model is working, as indicated by our overall achievement data. All of our students are steadily improving; however, we have not completely closed our gaps. Students get more individualized attention from teachers and/or instructional assistants due to our flexible grouping model. Our special education staff "pushes in" the classrooms, as opposed to pulling kids out, which allows those specialists to help additional students, as well as the students on their caseloads. Data does indicate that we may need to look at more specific structures for tier 3 interventions within the classroom. Attendance continues to be an issue. Our overall attendance rate dropped from 96.1% in 2017-18 to 95.8% in 2018-19. To address this, we have school-wide attendance goals, rewards, and competitions to help motivate the students into coming to school. We've also set up an "attendance group" with most at-risk/truant students.

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.

In the spring, a representative from each grade level (K-5), all members of the special education team, and school administrators work together to develop a

master schedule for the upcoming school year that is centered around our special education students. Once completed, the master schedule is then presented to our SBDM council for review and approval. When our state test results come back in the fall, our entire staff disaggregates the data and makes recommendations for updating our school improvement plan based on our results. Once the plan has been revised, the staff and the SBDM council review and approve the updated plan. Our school improvement plan is then posted on our school website for public viewing.

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.)*

Over the last several years, all elementary teachers across our district have had reading and math professional development training. Elementary grade-level teams also meet annually to discuss standards, review learning targets, and create assessments that are congruent to their standards. Teachers share resources, research-based strategies, and structures that will maximize the instruction in their classrooms. Administrators look for the implementation of specific reading and math structures during weekly walkthroughs. Teachers are given specific feedback on what instructional strategies/structures they are doing well on and what needs to be improved. Teachers and administrators also monitor formative and summative assessment data on a routine basis. Data discussions occur frequently and student results directly impact the instructional program.

### 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).

Goals for our economically disadvantaged students: The percentage of students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading will improve from 73.3% to 78% in 2020-21 according to K-Prep results. The percentage of students scoring proficient/distinguished in math will improve from 60.3% to 68% in 2020-21 according to KPrep. Goals for our students with disabilities: The percentage of students scoring proficient/distinguished in reading will improve from 64.4% to 75% in 2020-21 according to K-Prep results. The percentage of students scoring proficient/distinguished in math will improve from 51.1% to 68% in 2020-21 according to KPrep.

#### 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.

At each grade level, our teachers utilize the MAP assessment, and other reading and math assessments, at three different points during the year (fall, winter, spring) to group students into three flexible groups. The lowest group is co-taught by a regular ed and a special ed teacher. The middle group is co-taught between a regular education teacher and an instructional assistant. The students in the high group are taught by a regular education teacher. Within each classroom, students are grouped according to summative and formative assessment data in order to provide intentional instruction on grade-level standards. Enrichments and interventions are delivered based on student performance and assessment results. Every Friday, we implement a Review Day. Students are grouped according to the formative assessment data from the week. Those that need intervention receive it, while those that need enrichment receive that also. Students monitor their own data weekly based on goals created in conjunction with their teachers. Classroom and grade-level data is discussed in weekly PLC's with school administrators.



# Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 JCES Achievement Gap Groups	JCES Achievement Gap Groups	• I
 Master Schedule 2020-21	Master Schedule	• II.A
 <u>School Report Card</u>	State assessment results from 2018-19 school year	• II.B