

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10102019_14:04

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Woodland Middle School
Christi Jefferds
5399 Old Taylor Mill Rd
Taylor Mill, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/16/2019
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	4
Protocol	5
Current State	6
Priorities/Concerns	7
Trends	8
Potential Source of Problem.....	9
Strengths/Leverages	11
Attachment Summary	12

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

In its most basic form, continuous improvement is about understanding the **current state** and formulating a plan to move to the **desired state**. The comprehensive needs assessment is a culmination of an extensive review of multiple sources of data collected over a period of time (e.g. 2-3 years). It is to be conducted annually as an essential part of the continuous improvement process and precedes the development of strategic goals (i.e. desired state).

The needs assessment requires synthesis and analysis of multiple sources of data and should reach conclusions about the **current state** of the school/district, as well as the processes, practices and conditions that contributed to that state.

The needs assessment provides the framework for **all** schools to clearly and honestly identify their most critical areas for improvement that will be addressed later in the planning process through the development of goals, objectives, strategies and activities. 703 KAR 2:225 requires, as part of continuous improvement planning for schools, each school complete the needs assessment between October 1 and November 1 of each year and include: (1) a description of the data reviewed and the process used to develop the needs assessment; (2) a review of the previous plan and its implementation to inform development of the new plan; and, (3) perception data gathered from the administration of a valid and reliable measure of teaching and learning conditions. Further, as required by Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools implementing a schoolwide program must base their Title I program on a comprehensive needs assessment.

Protocol

Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results. Include names of school/district councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

At Woodland Middle School, data drives our decision making and we have developed a specific process for reviewing, analyzing, and applying results. When individual student KPREP results were released in August 2019, they were shared with teachers in weekly PLCs following the signing of a nondisclosure agreement. These results were used to inform instruction for the current school year for these individual students. The KPREP results were analyzed by the Principal and Assistant Principal in monthly District Leadership Meetings and Curriculum and Instruction Meetings. This was documented by meeting agendas. The SBDM Council and school staff will participate in an in-depth data analysis session on October 23. Results will be shared with the PTSA at the November 13 meeting. Overall results and links to the School Report Card were shared with parents in the Oct. 7 newsletter. Ongoing work using KPREP and other assessment results to improve school programs will continue throughout the 2019-20 school year during weekly PLC meetings, weekly MTSS Leadership Meetings, monthly Faculty Meetings, and monthly SBDM meetings.

Current State

Plainly state the current condition using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by past, current and multiple sources of data. These should be based solely on data outcomes. Cite the source of data used.

Example of Current Academic State:

- Thirty-four (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (54%) of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 57%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

The percentage of students scoring Proficient and Distinguished on KPREP Math rose from 45.4% in 2017/18 to 51.9% in 2018/19 (+ 6.5%). The percentage of students scoring Proficient and Distinguished on KPREP Reading rose from 58.1% in 2017/18 to 61.5% in 2018/19 (+ 3.4%). The KPREP Combined Proficiency Score was 75.6, which exceeded the state average of 72.3 (+3.3). The Social Studies Proficient and Distinguished KPREP score rose from 63.9% in 2017/18 to 67.8% in 2018/19 (+ of 3.9%). Novice scores for students with disabilities on KPREP Reading increased from 61.0% in 2017/18 to 61.5% in 2018/19. (+.5%). Novice scores for students with disabilities on KPREP Math decreased from 55.1% in 2017/18 to 41.8% in 2018/19 (-13.3%). The KPREP Social Studies Proficiency rate of 67.83% exceeded the state average of 58.8% (+9.03) on the KPREP in 2018/19. The student attendance rate improved slightly from 95.45% in 2017/18 to 95.9% in 2018/19 (+.45)

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

Example: Sixty-eight (68%) of students in the achievement gap scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

61.5% of students with IEPs scored novice on the KPREP reading test as opposed to just 10.3% of students without IEPs. 41.8% of students with IEPs scored novice on the KPREP math test as opposed to just 7.6% of students without IEPs. All students scoring proficient or distinguished on the On Demand Writing KPREP test decreased from 43.3% in 2017/18 to 36.52% in 2018/19 (-6.78). Students with IEPs scoring novice on the On Demand Writing KPREP test increased from 47.2% in 2017/18 to 59.4% in 2018/19 (+12.2)

Trends

Analyzing data trends from the previous two academic years, which academic, cultural and behavioral measures remain significant areas for improvement?

Student attendance has made slight improvement (+0.16) over the previous two academic years (95.45% in 2017/18, 95.61% in 2018/19) but remains below the district goal of 96.25%. The percentage of students with disabilities scoring below proficient on KPREP Reading continues to be significant over the previous two academic years (88.9% in 2017/18 and 89.9 in 2018/19). The percentage of students with disabilities scoring below proficient on KPREP Math continues to be significant over the previous two academic years (89.8% in 2017/18 and 91.3% in 2018/19). The percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished on the On Demand Writing KPREP test has remained mostly stagnant over the previous two years (39.3% in 2016/17, 43.3% in 2017/18, and 36.5% in 2018/19. Proficient and distinguished Science KPREP scores showed very little growth from 2017/18 (25%) to 2018/19 (25.1%).

Potential Source of Problem

Which processes, practices or conditions will the school focus its resources and efforts upon in order to produce the desired changes? Note that all processes, practices and conditions can be linked to the six Key Core Work Processes outlined below:

[KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards](#)

[KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction](#)

[KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy](#)

[KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data](#)

[KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)

[KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment](#)

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction•What systems/processes are in place to ensure Tier I instruction and assessments meet the intent of the adopted standards? Teachers submit lesson plans which are reviewed by administration for standards alignment. Teachers receive regular feedback through PPR walks. Teachers participate in PLCs focused on standards based instruction. Teachers analyze common assessment data to make instructional decisions for students. Teachers align their PD plan and Professional Growth Plan to growth areas. • What systems of collaboration are in place in order to meet the Tier I educational needs of all students? Teachers meet weekly in subject-specific PLCs to review and analyze student data and work samples to make instructional decisions. The principal meets monthly with Department Lead Teachers to discuss school wide and department-specific needs and to develop plans to address them. The SBDM Council meets monthly to review student achievement data and determine school wide approaches to make continuous improvement. District cadres meet throughout the year to share best practices, revise curriculum, and develop formative and summative assessments. • What is the protocol for ensuring Tier I and Tier II instructional needs are met and next steps for improvement are identified? PPR walks, feedback, PLCs, Professional Growth Plans, review of MAP data during PLCs, and monthly MTSS review of Tier II data. • How is learning monitored before, during, and after instruction? (Explicit Instruction) MAP scores are analyzed following each round of testing and the results are used to monitor student growth, place students in interventions or extensions as appropriate, Common Assessment data is reviewed and analyzed during weekly PLCs, and formative assessment during and after instruction is ongoing in all classrooms. • How do school/district leadership ensure teachers determine the most appropriate and effective high yield strategies to implement in order to ensure congruency to the intent of the learning target? We use the PLC structure and monthly Department meetings to share effective instructional practices and work closely with our district curriculum consultants during these meetings. KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data • How do teachers use these different types of assessment to ensure a balanced approach: Formative, Summative, Interim? Feedback through PPR walks and data-based PLCs allow us to balance our approach to assessments. • How do school/district leadership ensure that assessments are of high quality and aligned to the rigor of the standards, resulting in quality data? We use collaboratively developed common assessments and curriculum that are standards-based. • What questions do school/district leadership want teachers to answer with the data that they collect? Are students growing and performing at grade level in each subject area? If not, what are the barriers? When barriers have been identified, what steps need to be taken to overcome the barriers? What instructional practices are most effective in improving student achievement? • What systems are in place to ensure that student data is collected, analyzed, and being used to drive classroom instruction? We regularly review and analyze Common Assessment data, writing samples, and intervention progress data to drive classroom instruction. • How do school/district leadership ensure teachers use data to determine students' needs (e.g., movement through the tiers of intervention, grouping/regrouping, teacher

placement, scheduling)? Through the development of the master schedule with intentional scheduling of students, the development of the needs-based RTI period, and our MTSS structure . • How does a principal/district leader use all of the data and information to improve instruction and reduce the number of students scoring novice? As a school, we review student data including academic, behavioral, social emotional and mental health data of all students placed in a Tier II intervention on a monthly rotating basis. Attendance data is reviewed weekly at the Reducing Barriers to Learning meeting. As barriers are identified, interventions are put into place to help overcome them. The effectiveness of these interventions are monitored, and adjustments and/or the increase of the levels of support are made as needed. Our School Wide Literacy Plan includes training all teachers in effective, content-specific literacy practices, implementation of school wide On-Demand Writing, to include scoring calibration and analysis of the student pieces to focus future instruction on overall needs, and reading/discussing the book "Focus" by Mike Schmoker to strengthen discipline-specific literacy practices. Feedback and training centered on special education collaboration continues for all collaborating regular and special ed teachers to reduce the number of students with disabilities scoring novice, and all teachers are learning high-leverage instructional strategies to improve the student achievement levels of all students. High expectations with appropriate support are in place throughout the school, with standards-based learning targets, formative assessment during and at the end of lessons with ongoing lesson adjustments, and KPREP-like common assessments to determine student mastery. Our new RTI process provides support for students who need it, and enrichment for other students to differentiate their learning.

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school.

Example: Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

The certified staff turnover rate has decreased from 26% in 2016/17 and 2017/18 to its current rate of 6%. The percentage of students identified as Chronically Absent decreased from 10.78% in 2017/18 to 10.22% in 2018/19, a decrease of -0.56%, and -1.68% below our goal of 11.9%. Our Proficiency Indicator score rose from 70.5 in 2017/18 to 75.6 in 2018/19 (+5.1). The percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished in Social Studies was 67.83%, which exceeded the state average of 58.8% by +9.03.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------