



Dr. Donna Hargens, Superintendent

Frederick Law Olmsted Academy North & Frederick Law Olmsted Academy South Reconfiguration Evaluation Report

Beverly J. Winsch, Ph.D.
Evaluation Specialist

November 19, 2013

Revised Final

Department of Accountability, Research and Planning
Dr. Robert J. Rodosky, Chief

Background

In 2006, the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) audited and made recommendations for two Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) middle schools which had not made adequate academic progress within Kentucky’s accountability system. JCPS responded to the audit report by providing the following to each school beginning in 2007-2008; (a) embedded professional development via master teachers; (b) enhanced technology; (c) reduced class size; (d) extended days for staff; and (e) extra and co-curricular involvement. In 2008-2009, both schools became same sex (i.e., Olmsted South became an all-girls school and Olmsted North became an all-boys school) with the reconfiguration components listed above carrying over to each school. Since the reconfiguration, JCPS has invested a significant amount of General Fund resources to support the reconfiguration costs. Table 1 shows the distribution of 2013-2014 assets from the district’s General Fund to cover the cost of implementing the main components of the reconfiguration.

Changes since the reconfiguration include adoption of a new state accountability assessment, the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP), which raised accountability standards for the 2011-2012 school year. Also, the Olmsted South principal retired at the end of the 2010-2011 school year. The purpose of this report is to use the most recent academic outcomes to examine the effectiveness of the original reconfiguration design in meeting the new accountability standards, and to provide a platform for considering new ways to address the unique needs of these two schools.

Table 1. 2013-2014 JCPS GENERAL FUND ALLOCATIONS FOR OLMSTED RECONFIGURATION COMPONENTS*

	OLMSTED SOUTH	OLMSTED NORTH
* **ADD-ON TEACHERS	\$1,168,500 (19 STAFF)	\$891,750 (14.5 STAFF)
ADD-ON ASST. PRINCIPAL	\$96,863	\$96,863
OTHER CERTIFIED EXTENDED TIME	\$63,762	\$63,762
OTHER CLASSIFIED EXTENDED TIME	\$10,240	\$10,240
GENERAL FUND COST	\$1,310,865	\$1,062,615

*Includes cost of fringe benefits. **Add-on teachers and Title I teachers combined provide the following:

























































- 1.) Class-size reduction from 28 to 1 to 20 to 1
- 2.) Five (5) Master Teachers that only carry 1/2 of instructional load
- 3.) Embedded PD
- 4.) Increased art-music
- 5.) Sustainability of existing staff levels proportional to new-year enrollment
- 6.) A JCTA MOA Existed but is no longer incorporated into contract

Major Findings

- **ATTENDANCE:** 2011 (K-PREP baseline) vs. 2013 attendance improved by .5% for Olmsted North and declined by .1% for Olmsted South. Attendance for district middle schools improved by .1%.
- **SUSPENSIONS:** 2011 (K-PREP baseline) vs. 2013 suspensions declined by 8% (i.e., 267 vs. 246) for Olmsted North and increased by 28% (i.e., 162 vs. 207) for Olmsted South. Suspensions for district middle schools declined by 16.2%.
- **K-PREP:** Because reading and math are considered for four of five K-PREP accountability components and are the only content areas measured for the growth component, proficiency in these areas is most closely examined in this evaluation report.
 - **ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE:** The 2013 Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) was exceeded by Olmsted South (40.5 points) by 2 points while Olmsted North (33.8 points) missed its AMO by 1 point.
 - **ACHIEVEMENT:** 2013 achievement data are shown in Table 2. It is noteworthy that the proficient/distinguished rate for Olmsted North in math (14.7%) was nearly half that of Olmsted South (28.9%). Both schools were lower than the district (33.2%). The trend was the same for reading with Olmsted North having a proficient/distinguished rate of 17.6% and Olmsted South having a proficient/distinguished rate of 25.4%. The district's proficient/distinguished rate for reading was 42.1%.
 - **GAP:** Both Olmsted North (18.1%) and Olmsted South (16%) had a higher rate of limited English proficiency (LEP) students taking the K-PREP assessment than the district average (4.2%). 18.8% of the Olmsted North students who were assessed had an individualized education plan (IEP) compared to 8.2% at Olmsted South, and 11.6% for district middle schools overall. LEP scores for proficient/distinguished performance declined 1.3% in math and gained 4.3% in reading at Olmsted North. LEP scores for proficient/distinguished performance declined .4% in math and gained 6.6% in reading at Olmsted South. The district showed gains in both math (.6%) and reading (5.4%) for LEP students. IEP scores for proficient/distinguished performance declined in math (2.4%) and rose in reading (3.3%) for Olmsted North students. IEP scores for Olmsted South students showed a gain of 3.5% in math and a gain of 5.2% in reading in the percent of students scoring proficient or distinguished. The district declined in the percent of students scoring proficient or distinguished by .8% in math and increased 5.2% in reading. The gap data is shown in Table 2.
 - **GROWTH:** Olmsted North declined 3.1% in growth while Olmsted South gained in growth by 4.4%. Note that growth is based solely on combined performance in reading and math – Olmsted North declined in both and Olmsted South grew in both. Both the district (2.4%) and the state (.5%) declined in growth for 2013. The growth data is shown in Table 3.

- **COLLEGE/CAREER READINESS:** Olmsted North gained 2.3% in College and Career Readiness (CCR) which outperformed the district (1.6% gain) while Olmsted South gained 3.8% and outperformed the district and the state (3.1% gain). The CCR data is shown in Table 4.

Table 2. 2013 K-PREP ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS*

%Proficient/Distinguished (2013   Change)						
	Language Mechanics (6 th grade)	Math (all grades)	Reading (all grades)	Science (7 th grade)	Social Studies (8 th grade)	Writing (6 th and 8 th grades)
OLMSTED NORTH (N=653)**	7.4 	14.7 	17.6 	30.4 	42.5 	9.7 
LEP (N=118; 18.1%)**	2.6 	12.7 	9.3 	22.7 	36.1 	10.8 
IEP (N=123; 18.8%)**	2.6 	2.4 	8.1 	15.1 	25 	1.4 
OLMSTED SOUTH (N=755)**	20.8 	28.9 	25.4 	26.6 	32.3 	18.9 
LEP (N=121; 16%)**	0 	18.2 	9.1 	5.3 	11.4 	6.2 
IEP (N=62; 8.2%)**	4 	4.8 	6.5 	3.8 	0 	2.8 
DISTRICT MIDDLE (N=21,275)**	36.5 	33.2 	42.1 	45.3 	47.7 	34.5 
LEP (N=899; 4.2%)**	6.9 	10.9 	10 	14.8 	20.1 	12.2 
IEP (N=2,472; 11.6%)**	9 	7.2 	12.8 	16.6 	17.9 	8 

**Please that while these are the official accountability data reported by KDE, all K-PREP data include results for students who attended an alternative school where KDE accountability rules mandate that test scores “track back” to the resides school (i.e, approximately 22 students for Olmsted North, 16 students for Olmsted South). **Number and percent of students assessed for reading and math (all grades).*

Table 3. 2013 K-PREP GROWTH RESULTS









	2012 Reading Percent Making Typical or Higher Annual Growth	2012 Math Percent Making Typical or Higher Annual Growth	2012 Combined Reading and Math Growth Points Total	2013 Reading Percent Making Typical or Higher Annual Growth	2013 Math Percent Making Typical or Higher Annual Growth	2013 Combined Reading and Math Growth Points Total	Change in Combined Reading and Math Growth
OLMSTED NORTH	48.5	51.4	50.0	44.7	49.1	46.9	-3.1 
OLMSTED SOUTH	44.7	63.6	54.2	53.1	64.1	58.6	4.4 
DISTRICT MIDDLE	56.8	59.9	58.4	54.6	57.4	56.0	-2.4 
STATE MIDDLE	60.4	60.4	60.4	59.8	60.0	59.9	-0.5 

Table 4. 2013 K-PREP COLLEGE/CAREER READINESS RESULTS

	2012 %CCR	2013 %CCR	Change
OLMSTED NORTH	15.1	17.4	2.3 
OLMSTED SOUTH	17.9	21.7	3.8 
DISTRICT MIDDLE	36.0	37.6	1.6 
STATE MIDDLE	44.1	47.2	3.1 

Conclusions and Recommendations

The KDE introduced the new K-PREP assessment in the spring of 2012. The K-PREP is designed to measure learning outcomes aligned with the more rigorous common core curriculum. Under the KCCT, both Olmsted schools had shown academic progress. However, after one year of performance data for the K-PREP assessment, it was prudent to examine the progress of Olmsted North and Olmsted South. Olmsted South was one of nine JCPS middle schools which met its AMO for 2013. K-PREP growth for Olmsted South outpaced both the district and the state. Work is needed in science and writing; especially with the LEP and IEP students. However, Olmsted South appears to be responding successfully to the increased academic challenges of the common core and the K-PREP assessment. Some resources may need to be redirected toward behavior management since the upward trend in suspensions has continued into this school year- suspensions are up 35% as of the third pupil month this year compared to the same time period last year (i.e., 24 vs. 40 suspensions).

Olmsted North’s overall K-PREP score declined slightly from 2012 to 2013. The K-PREP growth score declined in both reading and math; though proficiency in reading and language mechanics did show improvement. Unfortunately, though there was improvement in reading; the proficiency rate is still only 17.6%. Olmsted North also declined in proficiency for math overall; and across the IEP and LEP groups (writing scores showed the same trend). The decline in math scores strongly factors into four of the five components of K-PREP; affecting half of the growth component. Meeting the **unique** challenges of the IEP and LEP students is key to improving the academic success of Olmsted North since these students make up such a large proportion of the student population; nearly 20% of the Olmsted North population has an IEP. Thus, it is recommended that a substantial portion of resources be reallocated to provide research-based supports designed to significantly accelerate the academic success of these students.