



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for NOMS

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

North Oldham Middle School
jenna Daulton

1801 S Highway 1793
Goshen, Kentucky, 40026
United States of America

Table of Contents

2020-21 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	10

2020-21 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, 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 councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

Data analysis at North Oldham Middle School takes a number of forms. As a school, we compile longitudinal data on all of our students starting in 3rd grade. The school's master schedule is loaded into a data dashboard and teachers are able to see the performance of each student in their classroom on fall, winter and spring NWEA MAP assessments and KPREP. We focus during pre-service for the school year on student's most recent reading, math and language MAP scores and create "class profiles" so that teachers can understand and anticipate the needs of students in each of their class periods. When KPREP scores are made available, we triangulate current grades, KPREP and MAP scores to confirm student placement in Tier II and Tier III classes and to look for trends by grade, subject and skill. In PLCs, teachers meet weekly to discuss student performance, review the impact of lessons in a given unit and answer the 5 core PLC questions. Each week teachers keep a PLC journal that captures their reflections on the lessons they have taught and the impact of their teaching on student learning. Each month, Content Leaders meet to discuss the work of teachers within their department. Trends in student performance are discussed and Content Leaders reflect on the work of teachers in their department during content team meetings, teacher work days and PLC observations. Instructional supports are organized, with the guidance and support of an instructional coach, to help teachers and students based on trends across the school. Our MTSS team also meets monthly. This group looks at students' academic, behavioral and attendance data to ensure that we are supporting the whole child and organizing data driven interventions for students in Tier II and Tier III. On a 6-8 week cycle, intervention groups are reviewed and students exit, continue to receive additional supports based on the data that has been gathered.

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 percent (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2018 to 2020, the school saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four percent (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 2019-20 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2018-19 to 288 in 2019-20.
- Survey results and perception data indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

-80.4% of student score proficient in reading compared to the state average of 59.6%-75.1% of students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 46.4%. -83.7% of student score proficient in social studies compared to the state average of 58.8%-From 2016-17 to 2017-18, our scores in writing grew from 46.4 to 48.8 – a total of 2.4%.

Priorities/Concerns

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

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template.

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.

Gap- Reading-35.1% of our students supported in special education scored proficient in reading compared to 85.2% of students in general education classes. This created a 50.1 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. -53.5% of students living in poverty scored proficient in reading compared to 83.2% of students who live above the poverty line. This created a 29.7 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. Math-28.4% of our students supported in special education scored proficient in math compared to 80.1% of students in general education classes. This created a 51.7 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. -43.5% of students living in poverty scored proficient in math compared to 78.3% of students who live above the poverty line. This created a 34.6 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. Social Studies-44.4% of our students supported in special education scored proficient in social studies compared to 86.8% of students in general education classes. This created a 42.4 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. -70% of students living in poverty scored proficient in social studies compared to 85% of students who live above the poverty line. This created a 15 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. Writing-From 2016-17 to 2017-18, our scores in writing grew from 46.4 to 48.8 – a total of 2.4%. -16.7% of our students supported in special education scored proficient in writing compared to 51.3% of students in general education classes. This created a 34.6 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. -40% of students living in poverty scored proficient in writing compared to 49.6% of students who live above the poverty line. This created a 9.6 point achievement gap in reading between these groups. Growth- Growth in Math was 50.6% and 40.5% in Reading for a combined growth score of 52.7. To be considered high growth the total growth rate would be 57%.

Trends

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

Reading-From 2017 to 2020 overall proficiency in reading grew from 79.1 to 80.4. -From 2017 to 2020 proficiency in reading for students supported in special education declined from 48% to 35.1% - a 12.9 point drop over three years. -From 2017 to 2020 proficiency in reading for students living in poverty declined from 63% to 53.5 - a 9.5 point drop over three years. Math -From 2017 to 2020 overall proficiency in math dropped from 75.7 to 75.1. -From 2017 to 2020 proficiency in math for students supported in special education declined from 43% to 32% - an 11 point drop over three years. -From 2017 to 2020 proficiency in math for students living in poverty declined from 49% to 46.8% - a 2.2 point drop over three years.

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](#)

Our school team has identified an area to focus our resources in the coming school year. From the data we have shared thus far, it is clear that students supported in special education have struggled to keep up with their peers on our campus. As a school team, we know that these students have individualized goals that they are working toward within their IEP and we know that they are supported in special education because they have a documented disability. Our first area of focus is on the design and delivery of instruction. We know that high quality instruction is a key factor impacting student learning. For students supported in special education, instruction is delivered primarily in a resource classroom or in a co-taught classroom. We see an opportunity to and support our ECS teachers by using a strengths based coaching cycle approach. This model, which has not be used with ECS teachers on our campus before, will allow us to carefully analyze the design and delivery of specially designed instruction within our resource and co-taught classrooms through series of brief observation and feedback sessions scheduled over the course of the school year. Our school team believes that a focus on instructional coaching is the first step to addressing the achievement gap we see on our campus. Secondly, ECS teachers and our intervention teacher will be working with gen ed teachers to share learning profiles for each student in the area of reading to help with specific interventions. Additionally, identified students in resource setting or Intervention will start tracking their own learning targets by Lexile and use

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%.

-Reading proficiency has remained above 80% for the past two years. -Multiracial students have closed the achievement gap in reading over the last 4 years and now outperform white students by 5 points. (White:79.6% vs. Multiracial:84.6%). -Math proficiency has remained above 73% for the past five years. -The number of novice students in social studies has declined from 2.3 in 2014-15 to 1.6 in 2018-19 – a decline of .7 points. -Hispanic students have closed the achievement gap i social studies over the last three years and now outperform white students by 7.8 points. (White: 82.2 vs. Hispanic: 90)

Attachment Summary

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