



2020-21 Phase Three: Goshen Closing the Achievement Gap
Diagnostic_10272020_10:35

2020-21 Phase Three: Closing the Achievement Gap Diagnostic

Goshen At Hillcrest Elementary School

Ryan Rodosky

12518 Ridgemoor Drive
Prospect, Kentucky, 40059
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

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.

See attached.

II. Achievement Gap Analysis

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

Goshen is a high performing school and our academic success can be attributed to the continuous work towards strong collaboration among all teachers and support staff. Our Professional Learning Communities (PLC) are established to support the thought process that to enrich lessons, we must first analyze the students' work for a strong understanding of student success and growth areas. In depth data analysis assists teachers in developing lessons of inquiry and encourages higher level thinking in and out of the classroom. RTI (Response to Intervention) is implemented as a means of helping our struggling students reach individualized goals, develop new goals, and internalize concepts. Through the RTI process, teachers will utilize research-based practices and instructional strategies for reading intervention. By identifying struggling students at an early age, teachers are able to assist students in quickly closing achievement gaps. Differentiation of lessons based on individual student needs will be utilized for students needing specialized instruction in reading and writing content. Teachers will utilize small intentional group work to focus on reading and writing difficulties. Selected students will work individually with the reading recovery teacher or in small intervention groups for reading and math student support. Direct instruction in math will be utilized to teach skills to ECE and EL Students. There will be repetition of concepts, re-teaching of concepts, and independent practice that includes writing to learn and writing to demonstrate learning through all content. The addition of a second school counselor has allowed more Tier 1 emotional support in the classroom through the program Sanford Harmony. More counselor to student interactions allows higher relationship building with our Gap students.

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

In reading, the achievement gap for Hispanic students, students of two or more races and EL students have decreased. The achievement gap for Hispanic students has decreased from 28.4 in 2016-17 to 2.9 this past school year. The achievement gap for students of two or more races has decreased from 11.7 to -3.9. Students of two or more races are performing better than their non-gap peers. In Math, the achievement gap for students of two or more races has been eliminated, going from 22.4 to -2. Students of two or more races are achieving higher than their non-gap peers.

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.

The reading gap for EL students has decreased from 20.7 in 2017-18 to 12.2 in 2018-2019. Also, the math gap for EL students has reduced from 19.5 to 5.3. The math gap for Hispanic students has also decreased, going from 36 in 2016-17 to 10.7 this past year. In math, students with disabilities showed some improvement, decreasing the math gap from 54.1 in 2016-17 to 41.9 last 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 reading students with disabilities and students of poverty continue to have achievement gaps compared to their non-gap peers. In reading, the gap for students with disabilities increased from 39.7 in 2016-17 to 52.8 last year. Students of poverty decreased from 2016-17 to 17-18 from 31.5 to 8, but increased from 17-18 to 18-19 from 8 to 28. In math, the gap for our students of poverty increased from 42.7 in 2016-17 to 44.1 this past year.

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

Goshen continues to reflect on data and refine plans to meet the students' needs in the area of GAP. Our Intervention block is intentional for all grade levels and is used to 'push in' with extra support. We are able to target small groups of students and intentionally support students in specific skills. A homework club is available for our EL population along with our afterschool ESS program where intentional math, reading and writing instruction is provided. Math Modules are utilized to strengthen that area in our NDG group. Goshen continues to require Guided Reading groups supported by our Reading Recovery teacher and school intervention coordinator. Our school focus has been on Common Formative Assessment, which helps our teachers drill down to the essential standards needed for improving student learning. All classroom teachers create flexible groups in the area of Reading and Math and develop, with the use of pre-assessments, where strong instructional focuses will be applied after collaboration of teams and research on best practices is completed.

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.

The Instructional Team consists of: Ryan Rodosky, Principal; Dana Graham, Assistant Principal; Melinda Nevills, Counselor; Nikki Snow, Counselor; Kayla Thurman, LMS; Anne Cochran, Instructional Coach; and Hilary Costello, Intervention Coordinator. Team Leaders are: Katie Embry, Shelly Graf, Erin Roberts, Melissa Durham, Pam Mann, Rachel Schardine, Patricia Raybine, and Stephanie Vernak. SBDM Council includes Rachel Page, Teacher; Jaqueline Harbin, Teacher; Ryan Rodosky, Chair; Dan Kessler, Parent; Brittany Floyd, Parent; and Hilary Costello, Teacher.

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.)

All staff engaged in a summer book study facilitated by our instructional coach. Our instructional staff read *The Reading Guide to the Reading Workshop* by Lucy Calkins. Outcomes include aligning reading workshop best practices across grade K-5, providing a clear understanding of the essentials of reading workshop, building understanding of effective conferring and small group strategies and resources, understanding ways to launch and teach book clubs, understanding how to best utilize read-alouds, word study and shared reading, building understanding of how to support differentiated instruction and providing resources and strategies to use assessment to guide instruction. With this being our first year of implementation with the Reading Units of Study our focus will be on honing the mini lesson to ensure the teaching point and purpose is clear. We are beginning to develop and build understanding of the strategy groups, book clubs, and conferring to best meet the needs of students as readers.

III. Planning the Work

. 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).

Reading: To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of Hispanic students scoring P/D from 75% to 81.8% by 2025. (2021 = 77.5) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of Special Education students scoring P/D from 30% to 47.5% by 2025. (2021 = 37) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of 2 or More Races students scoring P/D from 81.8% to 89% by 2025. (2021 = 84.8) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of EL and Monitored students scoring P/D from 66.7% to 75.1% by 2030. (2021 = 70) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of Poverty students scoring P/D from 52.2% to 64.1% by 2030. (2020 = 56.9) Math: To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of Hispanic students scoring P/D from 60% to 70% by 2025. (2021 = 64) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of Special Education students scoring P/D from 33.3% to 49.9% by 2025. (2021 = 39.9) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of 2 or More Races students scoring P/D from 72.7% to 82.1% by 2025. (2020 = 76.5) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of EL and Monitored students scoring P/D from 66.7% to 75.1% by 2025. (2021 = 70.1) To close the achievement gap by increasing the % of Poverty students scoring P/D from 30.4% to 47.7% by 2025. (2021 = 37.4)



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.

See attached.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 2020-2021 Goshen Achievement Gap Group Spreadsheet.xlsx		.
 Goshen Closing the Achievement Gap 2020-2021		.