

Programs with Data from Data Management, Planning and Program Evaluation (DMPPE)

This document summarizes district-initiated programs/initiatives that DMPPE has worked with in the past year. **Only district programs/initiatives associated with new budget requests or renewal/continuation requests are listed in the chart below.** For school-level proposals, a review was conducted by the DMPPE office utilizing the following process:

- School-initiated end of cycle proposals were reviewed by Planning and Program Evaluation. Each proposal was rated for 1) Evidence of impact, 2) Whether they met their specified goal, and 3) Evidence of continued need.
- Based on this review about half of the proposals were deemed inadequate in their justification in one of the areas. Principals were given specific feedback so they could provide additional evidence or data for continued need and proposals were reviewed for a second time. All information was summarized and given to District Leadership for additional review.
- Two programs were discontinued (\$107,300).

District-Level Initiatives with DMPPE Data

District Initiative/ Program	Proposal ID	Data from DMPPE
MAP	78	<p>Latest update: March 2018</p> <p>Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Winter MAP window has closed and we have over 43,000 students tested in Reading and Math at the Elementary school level and over 20,000 students tested in Reading and Math at the Middle school level. Approximately 6,000 high school students have tested in Reading and Math, as well (optional testing at the high school level).• Preliminary data on growth on MAP shows the following we are slightly below average in growth (45% growth in Math and 46% in Reading) from Fall to Winter. The national average is 50%. <p>Bottom Line: The second window of data allows the district to focus on supporting educators in utilizing MAP growth data along with other formative assessments in making instructional adjustments and improvements for students who have not met growth.</p>
Bellarmine Literacy Project (Literacy Coaches)	41	<p>Latest update: February 2018</p> <p>Findings:</p> <p>Utilizing a Hierarchical Linear Model data analytic approach, analyses of students who were taught by a BLP teacher showed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Non-significant impact on 3rd grade reading if students had a BLP teacher for one instructional year• Statistically significant impact of having a BLP teacher if student had a BLP teacher for more than one year, but low effect size= 0.13

District Initiative/ Program	Proposal ID	Data from DMPPE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On average, if a student has had a BLP trained teacher for more than one year, an expected increase of 3 scale score points is expected in 3rd grade compared to students with no BLP trained teachers. <p>Bottom Line: Program shows some impact but not enough impact to demonstrate dramatic increases in 3rd grade reading levels.</p>
Mental Health Support for Students	72	<p>Latest update: January 2018</p> <p>Findings: Currently in 2017-2018, the district provided 48 mental health counselors serving 62 locations. Mental health counselors served 3,782 students and provided 11,346 hours of counseling hours for students. The most common reason for contact was peer relations and disruptive behavior, while counselors use case management and problem-solving techniques most often. Compared to the same time frame in the previous academic year, we have seen a 38% growth among students exhibiting signs of self-harm or suicidal behavior. This only accounts for 62 schools and the need across the district is unknown.</p> <p>Bottom Line: The evidence of need for mental health counseling continues to grow and trends from these schools may reflect further need across the district.</p>
Deeper Learning Symposium	141	<p>Latest update: June 2017</p> <p>Findings: JCPS launched the first Deeper Learning symposium in 2017. Feedback on professional learning was collected from participants who attended the symposium. Participant feedback from the symposium was collected through PD Central (for overall perception), Guidebook (app for individual sessions), and Googleform (for school-level reflection). PD Central data showed that the symposium was rated high in how it extended participant knowledge and skills (95% agreement) and for supporting professional growth (92% agreement). The Guidebook application was not utilized to a high level for rating individual sessions. Out of the 139 sessions, only 25 sessions had at least 5 reviews and data from Guidebook showed variation in session quality with an average rating of 3.7 stars out of 5. Keynotes were highly rated with an average of 4.3 stars out of 5. The recommendation for next year is to explicitly communicate to participants to utilize the app for session reviews. School reflection forms were completed by 111 different school locations, and overall responses showed that project-based learning, personalized learning, and authentic assessments were the top 3 areas where schools were wanting to implement and needed more support. The Deeper Learning Resource team have utilized the feedback in developing their support plan. Survey feedback is also being utilized to improve the symposium for 2018.</p> <p>Bottom Line: Qualitative feedback from the first symposium was positive. It provided a launching for schools to self-assess deeper learning entry points and coordinate their deeper learning strategies and approaches. Further improvements are being made in the areas of increasing consistent session quality, expanding access to more JCPS</p>

District Initiative/ Program	Proposal ID	Data from DMPPE
		educators, and developing opportunities to offset the cost by allocating some paid registration slots to non-JCPS educators.
Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)/ Restorative Practices (RP)	958	<p>Latest update: June 2017</p> <p>Number of Schools Participating = 91 JCPS and 7 state agency schools Total Number of Students = 60, 212</p> <p>Program Goals: Decrease school referrals (including suspensions) and improve attendance rate for minority and special education students, as well as for the overall student population. Improve the number and percentage of schools annually implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity.</p> <p>Implementation Year and History: JCPS is in Year 4 of implementing the PBIS framework districtwide in schools. Schools adopted PBIS practices using a cohort model (i.e., groups of schools have begun training in different years). This framework of practices is intended to circumvent potential Tier 1 behaviors by providing students with basic expectations for behavior with an emphasis on positive reinforcement of appropriate behaviors.</p> <p>JCPS added Restorative Practices with training on PBIS as a result of concerning behavior data trends over several years, particularly with high racial disproportionality in suspensions. The RP model builds respectful relationships, contributing to positive school climate change for students and staff. In addition, RP model addresses Tier 1 and 2 student behavior issues after they occur to encourage students to take responsibility for their actions and work towards repairing the damage they inflicted on fellow students and/or adults. JCPS is one of several districts nationally to train school personnel to implement PBIS and RP in an integrated fashion. Some RP practices include techniques for verbalizing statements, questioning, listening, reframing, circles, and conferences for formal restorative sessions.</p> <p>Findings: Regarding PBIS, schools are at different levels of success in their implementation depending on when they entered the cohort. In spring 2017, JCPS identified 71 schools as Exemplary in their implementation and integrity in using PBIS practices while five state agency schools were also given the same designation.</p> <p>Regarding RP, 10 schools entered the pilot this fall. Eight new schools will be added to the RP program beginning in the 2018-2019 school year. As of the end of February 2018, Restorative Practice elementary schools were outperforming the district on suspension incidents, suspension days, and in-school suspensions. Referrals were down 4%. Restorative Practice high schools were outpacing the district, showing reductions in out-of-school</p>

District Initiative/ Program	Proposal ID	Data from DMPPE
		suspensions (-30%), suspension days (-26%), in-school suspensions (-34%), and referrals (-33%). One of the two alternative schools showed reduction in out-of-school suspensions (-48%), reduction in suspension days (-44%), reduction in-school suspensions (-43%) and a 43% reduction in referrals. Data for Restorative Practice middle schools don't yet show favorable trends for the year; though two of the three schools have shown improvements in the suspension data in the past two months.
Literacy Design Collaborative (LDC) and Math Design Collaborative (MDC)	137, 98	<p>Latest update: June 2017</p> <p>Findings: To determine if there was a significant difference between students of participating teachers and students of non-participating teachers a matched-pair t-test was used on a) the 2016 KPREP reading (RD) and math (MA) Scale Score, b) the 2016 KPREP student RD/MA Growth Percentile, and c) the 2016 Writing (WR) Scale Score. The students of participating LDC teachers had a statistically significant ($p < .001$) higher RD Scale Score, RD Growth Percentile, and WR Scale Score. The students of participating MDC teachers had a statistically significant higher scale score ($p < .001$) and growth percentile ($p < .001$). The effect sizes are considered to be small.</p> <p>Bottom Line: Although it cannot be concluded exclusively that the LDC and MDC Programs are the reason for these positive results due to the possibility of teacher selection bias, this analysis does provide evidence that the LDC and MDC Programs are likely a positive contributing factor to higher student achievement.</p>
Summer Literacy Boost	164	<p>Latest update: February 2017</p> <p>Findings: Evaluation of the 2015 Summer Literacy Boost cohort found that students who attended the program as rising first-graders had statistically significant higher reading levels in their spring 1st-grade DRA assessments than students who were eligible for the program but did not attend. However, students remained significantly behind the target grade level. No impact was found on rising 2nd-graders who attended the program.</p> <p>Bottom Line: Summer Boost appears to show an impact on regression prevention for rising 1st-graders. While non-attendees fell further behind in their expected reading level (widening gap), students who attended Summer Boost maintained their trajectory (gap remained, but did not widen).</p>
Kindergarten Readiness Camp (K-Camp)	33	<p>Latest update: February 2017</p> <p>Findings: The K-Camp served approximately 846 students. The data shows that this group went from 63.1% classified as "Kindergarten Ready" to 69.9% comparing the spring Embark (pre-measure) to the end of summer Embark (post-measure). Additionally, 74.8% of the students that participated in the K-Camp were classified as "Kindergarten</p>

District Initiative/ Program	Proposal ID	Data from DMPPE
		<p>Ready” compared to the overall district rate of 54.9% on the fall Brigance assessment. Similarly, the rate of students that participated in the K-Camp classified as “Kindergarten Ready” for students with disabilities, in LEP, and qualified for Free/Reduced Lunch all outperformed the comparable district group by nearly 20%, or more, on the Brigance assessment.</p> <p>Bottom Line: The Kindergarten Readiness Camp has shown to be consistent in getting students kindergarten ready using the Embark test and Brigance Scores.</p>