Kansas City Education Landscape
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• There is no overall analysis of the entire KCPS + Charter system

• There has been very little coordination / collaboration between KCPS & charter schools

• KCPS is taking the lead:
  – Conducting a system-wide assessment (achievement, demographics, mobility, financial implications, etc.)
  – Creating opportunities for district/charter collaboration

• GOAL: A STRONGER, SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION SYSTEM WITH BETTER OUTCOMES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL STUDENTS
SNAPSHOT OF SYSTEM LANDSCAPE: KCPS + CHARTERS
K-12 Historical Enrollment

Charter schools est' b
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Independence annexation (est. -3,500 KCPS students)

Charters
KCPS
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SY18 - SNAPSHOT OF KCPS SYSTEM

KCPS/CHARTER SYSTEM
26,520 students

- 15 HIGH SCHOOL OPTIONS
- 23 MIDDLE SCHOOL OPTIONS
- 45 ELEMENTARY OPTIONS
- 5 CHARTER SPONSORS
- 22 CHARTER SCHOOL OPERATORS
- 83 TOTAL SCHOOLS

SPRINGFIELD MO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
25,780 students

- 5 HIGH SCHOOL OPTIONS
- 11 MIDDLE SCHOOL OPTIONS
- 37 ELEMENTARY OPTIONS
- 53 TOTAL SCHOOLS
WHAT ARE THE IMPACTS OF A SYSTEM WITH 6,000 HS STUDENTS & 15 HIGH SCHOOLS?

Are students receiving comparable academic offerings?

Are students receiving comparable co-curricular & extra-curricular offerings?

2018 HIGH SCHOOLS
GRADES 9-12

SPRINGFIELD, MO VS. KC SYSTEM

7277 Total Students
1455 Average/Building
5 Total Buildings

6066 Total Students
404 Average/Building
15 Total Buildings
KCPS/Charter system serves 47% fewer students at 12th grade than at Kindergarten
LOTS OF CHOICE -- YET SYSTEM IS DIFFICULT TO NAVIGATE

+ designates schools that are adding a grade level each year
SYSTEM IS MORE ECONOMICALLY & RACIALLY SEGREGATED

Number of Segregated* Schools
70% Increase from 1999 to 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KCPS</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Intensively Segregated** Schools
300% Increase from 1999 to 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KCPS</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Charters first opened in SY2000
SY99: 65 KCPS schools (e.g., DESE building codes)
SY08: 81 schools (57 KCPS; 24 charters)
SY17: 69 schools (32 KCPS; 37 charters)

*Segregated Schools - More than 75% of children receive F/R Lunch and more than 75% are Black/Hispanic (GAO Report 2016)
**Intensively Segregated Schools - More than 90% F/R Lunch and 90% Black/Hispanic - (GAO Report 2016)
ONLY 55% OF STUDENTS (KCPS + CHARTER) ATTEND A FULLY ACCREDITED SCHOOL

SY 15-17 Students Enrolled in Fully Accredited School by Grade Level

Elementary: 40% (2015), 61% (2016), 59% (2017)
Middle: 54% (2016), 54% (2017)
High: 43% (2017)
System: 47% (2016), 55% (2017)
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
How Does Funding Work For Missouri Districts With Charter Schools?

- **Local Revenue Share**
  - Charters share in current and delinquent local property taxes
  - 2017-18, the amount was $4,577 per WADA

- **State Funding Revenue Share**
  - 2017-18, the amount was $4,022 per WADA making a total monthly payment to Charters of $8,599

  - *Local and State revenue are shared with charters as a reduction in the monthly foundation formula payment*
  - *This left $232 per District WADA per year (or $19 a month) in formula payment to KCPS*
### KCPS Net Revenues from State Foundation Formula & The Impact to Cash Flow and Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Net State Foundation Formula Annual Funding</th>
<th>Average Monthly Foundation KCPS received for roughly 13,000 WADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$20,150,000</td>
<td>$1,679,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$18,255,000</td>
<td>$1,521,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$10,148,000</td>
<td>$845,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$8,529,000</td>
<td>$710,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$12,274,000</td>
<td>$1,022,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16**</td>
<td>$12,365,000</td>
<td>$1,030,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$6,101,000</td>
<td>$508,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18***</td>
<td>$4,246,000</td>
<td>$353,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-17 est.</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>$316,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WADA decreased over this period by 2300 while KC total decrease was 3850 (roughly 11% each)

**increase to 96.50% funding and *** increase to “full funding”

These low monthly state payments require significantly higher fund balance as of June 30th
## Expenditure Per Pupil – An Indicator Of Fiscal Inefficiency In KC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>KCPS</th>
<th>KCPS Change over Time</th>
<th>Charter Average</th>
<th>Charter Change over Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$15,021</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$14,117</td>
<td>($904)</td>
<td>$12,566</td>
<td>$1,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$14,467</td>
<td>($554)</td>
<td>$12,497</td>
<td>$1,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$14,877</td>
<td>($144)</td>
<td>$12,932</td>
<td>$2,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$15,496</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$13,401</td>
<td>$2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$15,305</td>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$13,534</td>
<td>$2,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$15,280</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$13,584</td>
<td>$2,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$14,428</td>
<td>($593)</td>
<td>$13,678</td>
<td>$2,798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system as a whole has a high Cost per Pupil without many options for students.

While the cost per pupil is lower at charters, their demographics remain significantly different in the weighting categories.
Charter Funding –
Is It Sustainable For The Community?

• DESE payment Monthly $8,599 - Cost per Pupil Avg. of $13,678 x Avg. enrollment of 553

  Difference of $5,079 – Where does it come from?

  Average Total State Aid and Taxes $5,606,031

  Average Total School Nutrition Rev $655,508 Second largest revenue

  Average Total Gifts $613,153 Third largest revenue – 10% of total
Economic Inefficiency of the Kansas City System

• Multiple schools competing for the same pool of students

  Loss of Efficiency in Building and Class Size Causes Reduced Options for Students
  
  • Average Student to Admin Ratio
    
    | System   | Ratio | Spend  |
    |----------|-------|--------|
    | KC System| 161:1 | $56 million |
    | Springfield | 293:1 | $22 million |

• Total Spend for K-12 Instruction in 2016-17
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Spend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KC System</td>
<td>$115 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$93 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Total Spend for Extra Curricular in 2016-17
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Spend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KC System</td>
<td>$4.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$7.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Inefficiency Of The Kansas City System

Multiple schools competing for the same number of students

• **Buses for different schools in same neighborhoods impact on Transportation Expense**
  - Total Spend for Transportation in 2016-17
    - KC System: $28.7 million
    - Springfield: $11.1 million

• **Greater Number of Facilities Impact on Cost of Plant Expense**
  - Total Spend for Operation of Plant in 2016-17
    - KC System: $50.1 million
    - Springfield: $22.9 million
EDUCATION COLLABORATION
Ed Collaboration: Key Milestones

March 9, 2011 – Repurposing policy outlined expectations for sale/lease of surplus buildings to charter schools

March 17, 2015 - DESE approved KCPS charter sponsor proposal

August 25, 2015 – KCPS Board approved KCPS sponsorship of KCNA

January 24, 2018 – KCPS Board approved Ed Collaboration Guiding Principles

October 17, 2018 – KCPS Board approved Administration to proactively pursue sponsorship opportunities with UMKC-sponsored charter schools
The proposal shall **enhance education equity and opportunity** for students within KCPS boundaries.

The proposal shall **contribute to a more coordinated system** that provides for the educational needs of all children within KCPS boundaries. Moreover, the proposal shall **not compromise financial sustainability of the overall system nor contribute to inefficiency or redundancy**.

The proposal shall address an **unmet need and contribute to academic performance of the overall system**.

The proposing entity shall commit to **working with KCPS collaboratively as an educational thought partner**.
The proposing entity shall **demonstrate educational expertise and operational capacity** to manage a high-performing program.

The proposal shall ensure a process for data-sharing, and academic and financial **accountability that aligns with Missouri accountability standards for school districts**.

The proposing entity shall commit to build a program that values and promotes inclusion to ensure **diversity among students and staff**.

The proposal shall ensure effective **student, family, educator and community involvement** in the development and operation of the school.
## Collaboration Opportunities

**Tier 1**

**Shared best practices**
- Professional development
- ELL & SPED
- Classroom management
- Assessment & testing
- Parent involvement
- Classroom management
- Curriculum

**System-wide planning**

**Tier 2**

**Contract for KCPS service & resources**
- Nutrition services
- Maintenance & custodial services
- Accounting & payroll
- Core data reporting
- Safety & security
- Technology Services
- Fields/facilities

**Shared services/purchasing (e.g., contractor/vendors)**
- Transportation
- Professional development
- Assessment & testing
- Enrollment

**Tier 3**

**School model partnership**
- Contract “partnership” school
- KCPS-sponsored charter
- KCPS serves as charter LEA
- Co-location
Feedback for Mo Districts

- Understand impact of charter authorization in STL & KC

- Ask DESE/legislators to conduct impact analysis in STL & KC before replication or expansion into new markets

- Require impact analysis of any charters proposed in your school district (prior to DESE approval)

- Understand best practices recommendations – See Annenberg Institute for School Reform’s Public Accountability for Charter Schools
TO CREATE A STRONGER, SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION SYSTEM WITH BETTER OUTCOMES & OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL STUDENTS
Questions?
District Financial Update

Ms. Linda Quinley
### Operating Fund Balance Update
#### Incidental and Teachers’ Funds only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$180,685,362</td>
<td>$185,354,057</td>
<td>$189,489,183</td>
<td>$199,017,635</td>
<td>$195,106,527</td>
<td>$79,366,405</td>
<td>$75,939,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$172,648,988</td>
<td>$179,998,078</td>
<td>$181,573,866</td>
<td>$187,355,415</td>
<td>$196,456,817</td>
<td>$76,670,275</td>
<td>$75,953,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In (Out)</td>
<td>$(14,311,043)</td>
<td>$(3,692,119)</td>
<td>$(6,584,564)</td>
<td>$(8,520,829)</td>
<td>$(81,721)</td>
<td>$(7,871,105)</td>
<td>$(2,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue over E&amp;T</td>
<td>$(6,274,670)</td>
<td>$1,663,859</td>
<td>$1,330,753</td>
<td>$3,141,391</td>
<td>$(1,432,011)</td>
<td>$(5,174,975)</td>
<td>$(2,013,880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance as %age</td>
<td>33.32%</td>
<td>34.82%</td>
<td>34.70%</td>
<td>34.93%</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted FB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,608,895</td>
<td>$10,608,895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted FB %age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.52%</td>
<td>28.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Supports for Classrooms and Schools 2018-2019

Operating Budget Support Additions 2018-2019

- 1.70 Math Interventionists at an estimated cost of $112,500
- 4.20 Guidance Counselors at an estimated cost of $195,000
- 6.00 Social Workers at an estimated cost of $558,000
- 9.70 Home School Coordinator or ISS at an estimated cost of $485,000
- 11.50 Vice Principals at an estimated cost of $1,165,000

Title I Budget Support Additions 2018-2019

- 16.00 Reading Interventionists at an estimated cost of $1,120,000
- 12.30 Math Interventionists at an estimated cost of $861,000
- 3.00 Grad Lab Coaches at an estimated cost of $210,000
- 7.30 Home School Coordinator or ISS at an estimated cost of $350,000

Total Support Investment in 71.70 FTE at an estimated cost of $5,056,500 included in 2018-2019 Operating Budget be continued using the same resources in 2019-2020.

Strategic Plan
Pillar A – Priority 2 and 3
Pillar C – Priority 3
Pillar D – Priority 11
Questions?
Academic Achievement

Data Analysis Process

Dr. Trinity Davis
Data Analysis & Instructional Support Process

- Pre-Test
- Coaching for Instruction
- Post-Test
- Bridge Week
Pre-Test Process

- Testing window is communicated
- Assessment is based on priority standards for the quarter
- Curriculum Coordinators use item analysis to provide PD for differentiated instruction
- Curriculum Coordinators email and make on-site visits to teachers not in attendance for afterschool PD
Coaching for Instruction

- Modeling teaching of standards
- Aligning needs of students to resources
- Co-planning daily lesson plans based on data
- Analyzing data to inform flexible small groups
- Co-planning to create formative assessments
Post-Test & Bridge Week

- Analyze the data
- Determine standards below basic and areas of growth
- Revise curriculum based on district-wide results
- Spiral instruction next quarter in unit plan
Questions?
Data Analysis & Instructional Support Process

- Pre-Test
- Coaching for Instruction
- Post-Test
  - Bridge Week
Coaching for Instruction

- First Quarter: Curriculum support
- Second Quarter: Identify the use of technology to determine where and how to support the creation vs. consumption using technology
- Third and Fourth Quarter: Support and help teachers move from baseline data to the next level
Google Education: Formative Assessments

- Small numbers of teachers are using Google forms
Next Steps

• Gather examples from teachers
• Use teacher created examples in District curriculum
• Provide support for curriculum coordinators in developing formative assessments using Google Forms
School Improvement and Accountability

Ms. Elizabeth Austin
Monitoring Implementation of Continuous School Improvement

• Weekly Visits including 1:1 Ongoing Coaching, Instructional Support, and Instructionally Focused Walkthroughs

• Quarterly Data Consultations

• CIPD Network Consultations for Intensive Support
Interventions for Academic Improvement

Data Consults to Support Successful Interventions:

Monitoring each indicator below to determine improvement:

- Attendance: 40% of schools are meeting or exceeding attendance goals
- Suspensions: 46% of schools have decreased suspensions from September through October
- Walkthroughs: Principals are required to do five walkthrough cycles per week
- iReady: ELA and Math: baseline data to create personalized learning goals for students in each tier
- Achievement Series: Assessments used to determine interventions for learning gaps for quarter one, pre-test for quarter two informs quarter two instructional focus
Achievement Series Post-Test Data

- Students are administered pre-tests in each discipline
- Teachers utilize the data to make instructional decisions
- Students are administered post-tests in each discipline
- There is a one week “Bridge” for teachers to utilize post-test data to reteach concepts
- Post tests are disaggregated by sub-group (race, ELL, SpEd)
- Principals utilize this data as part of the PST information needed to make intervention decisions for students

### Quarter 1 Post Achievement Series Pct Correct

#### Disaggregated by Race, ELL, IEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Subject</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Multi</th>
<th>Pacific Island</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>African Centered Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts/Communication Arts</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Banneker Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts/Communication Arts</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carver Dual Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts/Communication Arts</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Academy of Excellence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts/Communication Arts</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Middle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts/Communication Arts</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts/Communication Arts</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KANSAS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Example: Algebra I Item Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Analysis Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Healthy School Cultures

Dr. Latesha Woodley
Problem Solving Team:

• Training for Leadership Teams
• All schools have implemented PSTs
• Trained on Behavior Intervention Strategies in alignment with the KCPS Code of Conduct
• Tiered System of Intervention
• Analysis of Data to Determine Next Steps at the School Level for Discipline, Behavior, and Socio-Emotional issues and concerns
Cultural Responsive Teaching and Learning

Curriculum Instruction Professional Development (CIPD)
- Job embedded professional learning on Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning
- Book Study

Student Support Team
- Presenting cycle of Professional Development on Trauma Informed Care
- Sensory Recovery Rooms
- Mindfulness
- Brain Breaks
High Performing School Culture

School Professional Development was initially focused on:

• September – November: Curriculum Alignment and Focus
• November – January: Focused on Rigor
• January – March: Student Understanding
• Principals and CIPD are Implementing Feedback Cycle
• Walkthrough Data Analysis Determined the Areas of Need for Professional Learning needs
Questions?
Walk Through Classroom Process and Rigor in the Classroom

Dr. Darrin Slade
Classroom Walkthroughs

Multiple checkpoints in the Walkthrough Process:

- Assistant Superintendent and Principal Walkthroughs
- CIPD network team Walkthroughs
- School Leadership Team Walkthroughs

Each school is required to do a minimum of five walkthroughs per week. The cycle includes observation, rating, and feedback session with the teacher.
### Sample Walkthrough Screen per Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth Objective 1</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth Objective 2</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Support Plan/Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough (completed by 12/14)</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough (completed by 12/14) #2</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough (completed by 12/14) #3</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough (completed by 4/19)</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough (completed by 4/19) #2</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough (completed by 4/19) #3</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample Walkthrough with Limited Feedback

**FOCUS:** Are the objectives and lesson activities based on appropriate Missouri grade-level standards?

8/23/18. The lesson in the co-taught classroom is aligned to grade level standard, but the learning target is not unpacked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RIGOR:** Do the content demands of tasks, questions, texts and materials align with the expectations defined by Missouri grade-level standards?

8/23/18. The content demands are low as students are simply writing definitions of FOC vocabulary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGOR:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDENT UNDERSTANDING:** Do all students demonstrate that they understand the standard/objective?

8/23/18. Students do not have an opportunity to demonstrate any understanding as they are simply copying definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT UNDERSTANDING:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**RIGOR:** Do the content demands of tasks, questions, texts and materials align with the expectations defined by Missouri grade-level standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGOR:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDENT UNDERSTANDING:** Do all students demonstrate that they understand the standard/objective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT UNDERSTANDING:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Non-examples
### Sample Walkthrough with Acceptable Feedback

#### FOCUS: Are the objectives and lesson activities based on appropriate Missouri grade-level standards?

**Learning Objective:** I can gather sources and evidence to answer my project research question.

- **Observations:** Students were working in teams or pairs on a google classroom assignment. Students were out of their seats and very talkative and many were in and out of work talking and playing around. One young lady sat on top of the desk. Another one sat by the fan most of the time not working but talking with two other students. It was difficult to focus on the academic work due to the behavior concerns.

- **However, the assignment did align with the learning objective and MLS to help sources and evidence to answer their PBL research question** however I did not see the teacher check for students understanding and progress with working through the objective.

**Glow:** You’ve built an effective lesson plan with precise learning objectives that can be accomplished in one lesson.

**Grow:** Routines an Procedures - revise any routine that needs more attention to detail or is inefficient, with particular emphasis on what students and teacher is doing at each moment. Address off task behavior and seek 100% compliance not being comfortable with partial compliance.

**LEVEL OF PRACTICE**

- **Focus:** Approaching

#### FOCUS: Are the objectives and lesson activities based on appropriate Missouri grade-level standards?

- **Science Objective:** Identify chemical changes by the type of reaction.

- **Teacher is using a Discover Ed video and article for the lesson.**

- **Students are watching a video about making cookies and chemical reactions. The video explains that when you put cookies in the oven and bake them the reaction is irreversible. Teacher stops the video to check for understanding on an vocabulary—What does irreversible mean? Students are called up and explains that you can’t take it back or change it.**

**LEVEL OF PRACTICE**

- **Focus:** Approaching

#### RIGOR: Do the content demands of tasks, questions, texts and materials align with the expectations defined by Missouri grade-level standards?

**Teacher continues to review and checks for understanding on what they have been so far in the video. She reviews what happens when ingredients are mixed and asks what kind of change it is... students physical but when you bake it, it is a “chemical” change.**

- **Each student has a science notebook with them attirbute out on their desk and on the carpet they are writing notes from the video. (steps of reactions and what each loves look.**

- **When students are struggling to come up with the answer she asks them to refer back to their notes and the anchor charts in the classroom.**

**LEVEL OF PRACTICE**

- **Rigor:** Approaching

#### STUDENT UNDERSTANDING: Do all students demonstrate that they understand the standard/objective?

**Teacher reviews again, what are you going to do and have students repeat the directions in her step by step. Teacher calls the students by row back to their seats to begin working. Each student will complete their assignment in Discovery Ed.**

**Assignment:** Students have a set of pictures and have to drag them into the correct box. Physical change or Chemical change. By utilizing Discover Ed with their assignment allows you a very quick way to check their work for student understanding. How will their scores impact your next steps?

**Ending Question:** Why can’t you reverse a chemical reaction?

**ACTION STEP:** To ensure differentiation for students struggling to keep up with the notes create a notes template with the main points already completed and then fill in the blank (examples, definitions or you could put definition and they put the correct vocabulary word - this could look different every day). Then continue to hold the accountable for taking notes and also ensure that they have the material in their notebooks for later use. It will also allow you to focus on the accuracy of the notes and task taking place vs. whether or not they are even working.

**SUGGESTION:** Create an anchor chart for physical and chemical changes with definition and examples.

**LEVEL OF PRACTICE**

- **Student Understanding:** Approaching
Questions?
RSIT Breakout Discussion
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