



2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_09152021_13:00

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

North Middletown Elementary School
Gail Graves
PO Box 69
North Middletown, Kentucky, 40357
United States of America

Table of Contents

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools Understanding Continuous Imp...	3
Attachment Summary	8

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment for Schools

The Needs Assessment Diagnostic will facilitate the use of multiple sources of data to determine the current reality and establish a foundation for decision-making around school goals and strategies. Once completed, the diagnostic will lead to priorities to be addressed in the comprehensive school improvement plan to build staff capacity and increase student achievement. The needs assessment 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).

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes).

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 to 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.

Protocol

1. Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results to determine the priorities from this year's needs assessment. Include names of school councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved, a timeline of the process, the specific data reviewed, and how the meetings are documented.

North Middletown Elementary analyzes data throughout the year to determine where their students are with mastering standards. Throughout the year we conduct MAP tests (our benchmark assessment) during fall, winter and spring. Teachers along with the principal and district personnel analyze the data from MAP against the previous assessments as well as year to year. The staff also conduct district learning checks throughout the year that align to our standards. The data for learning checks is analyzed through Grade Cam. All grade levels within our building (K-5) conduct Fontas and Pinnell Reading Assessments for fluency and determining individual text levels. Teachers also have their own teacher-made

assessments that are analyzed for units of study. Each year upon receiving KPREP scores (now known as the KSA), our team of classroom teachers divide up and analyze our data. We then brainstorm what we are doing that is working (our celebrations) and what is not working (needs for improvement). The staff take the list of needs and compose strategies and activities that could help our students grown in academics. This list is then used to determine our goals for the upcoming year. Our SBDM council also provide insight into our CSIP plan as does members of CKEC. Next, we create and approve our CSIP and use it to create a 30-60-90. The school 30-60-90 that correlates with our Comprehensive School Improvement Plan and is monitored throughout the year by staff, principal and the SBDM council. The CSIP and 30-60-90 include goals for areas targeted to grow students in as well as GAP areas. All teachers in our building (k-5) assist the principal in creating the goals and strategies for the CSIP. Goals are created using KPREP data (known as KSA) and monitored using MAP; Fontas and Pinnell; District Learning Checks and teacher made tests. All data within our building is analyzed and presented during weekly PLCs. Teachers along with the principal and support staff (Special Education; Reading Recovery; intervention teachers) work together to note what is working well with our students and where the gaps in learning are. Plans of action are created to target specific students with class intervention or pull out intervention. Intervention data is maintained and discussed during RTI Meetings monthly. Throughout the year, the SBDM monitors how our school is doing as a whole and by grade levels through data from KPREP/KSA, MAP, Fontas and Pinnell and District Learning Checks. SBDM Council for NMES: Kayla Burke, Parent; Neil Payne, Parent; Gail Graves, Principal; Katie Sparks, Teacher; Tiffany Adams, Teacher; Jeannie Adkinson, Minority Teacher; Amy Brown, Teacher. PLC Team Members: Kindergarten Lydia Tatman; First Grade-Tiffany Adams; Second Grade-Hannah Southall and Shelby Fulkerson; Third Grade- Shauna Phillips; Fourth Grade-Calyn Crowe ; and Fifth Grade-Amy Brown. Response to Intervention Teams: Include classroom teacher, Kendra Morabito, Interventionist; Jeannie Adkinson, Special Education and Katie Sparks, Reading Recovery. Parents are contacted as needed when moving students through the tiers.

Trends

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

Example of Trends

- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2019-20 to 288 in 2020-21.
- From 2018 to 2020, the school saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.

KPREP Data from 2018-2019 reflected 68.6% Proficiency and 69.9% for our Separate Academic rating. Our growth rate was 59.3% overall. Reading on KPREP grades 3-5 noted 48.4% were proficient/distinguished. NMES along with the other public schools in KY did not take the state assessment in 2019-2020. This narrative will compare our scores to that of 2018-2019. Our MAP scores will also be analyzed. Our school doesn't have enough students that are ELL or have a Disability to populate scores in those areas. We were, however, showing a GAP within our Economically Disadvantaged population in 2018-2019 and continue to see that as our GAP in 2020-2021. For this category 39.1% of our Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient/distinguished in the year 2018-2019. This was a low score in comparison to our 72.2% of Non-Economically Disadvantaged that scored proficient and distinguished. Our 2020-2021 data shows that our school is at 76.9% Economically Disadvantaged. Our KSA (KPREP) data in the area of reading shows that NMES was at 21% P/D. This is 18% less than in 2018-2019. We contribute some of this decline to COVID. Another factor may have been moving from paper/pencil to online testing. Our Math KPREP data for 2018-2019 reflected that 48.5% of our students were proficient/distinguished. As with reading scores, our school doesn't have enough students that are ELL or have a Disability to populate scores in those areas. Similar to the reading, our Economically Disadvantaged students were much lower in math (43.5%) compared to the Non-Economically disadvantaged at 61.1% P/ D. Therefore our GAP goals addressed reading and math for our Economically Disadvantaged. Our math KSA (KPREP) data for 2020-2021 shows that only 12.9% of our students scored P/D. This data reflects a 35.6% decrease in P/D scores from 2018-2019. We contribute some of this decline to COVID. Another factor may have been moving from paper/pencil to online testing.

Current State

3. Plainly state the current condition of the school using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by multiple sources of outcome data. 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.
- 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 rate was 84% for the 2020-21 academic year.

- Survey results and perception data indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

NMES Achievement Gap is the Economically Disadvantaged group. Our students data reflected that in reading only 21% of students were P/D compared to 2018-2019. This is 18% less P/D than in 2018-2019. Math KSA (KPREP) data shows that 13% of our students in the Economically Disadvantaged group met the proficient/distinguished benchmark in 2020-2021. This data reflects a 35.6% decrease in P/D scores from 2018-2019. The area of writing shows that 38.9% met the proficient/distinguished benchmark in 2020-2021 for the area of Economically Disadvantaged students. This was our area of celebration this year!

Priorities/Concerns

4. Clearly and concisely identify the greatest 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.

NMES Achievement Gap is the Economically Disadvantaged group. Our students data reflected that in reading only 21% of students were P/D compared to 2018-2019. This is 18% less P/D than in 2018-2019. Math KSA (KPREP) data shows that 13% of our students in the Economically Disadvantaged group met the proficient/distinguished benchmark in 2020-2021. This data reflects a 35.6% decrease in P/D scores from 2018-2019.

Strengths/Leverages

5. Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school. Explain how they may be utilized to improve areas of concern listed above.

Example: Reading achievement has increased from 37% proficient to its current rate of 58%. The systems of support we implemented for reading can be adapted to address our low performance in math.

The area of writing shows that 38.9% met the proficient/distinguished benchmark in 2020-2021 for the area of Economically Disadvantaged students. This was our area

of celebration this year! Our 2020-2021 overall average of Proficient/distinguished students for all groups was 50%. This was higher than the district and state. Our students can write and this should carry over to improvements in reading for many.

Evaluate the Teaching and Learning Environment

6. Consider the processes, practices and conditions evident in the teaching and learning environment as identified in 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](#)

Utilizing implementation data, perception data, and current policies and practices:

- a. Complete the [Key Elements Template](#).
- b. Upload your completed template in the attachment area below.

After analyzing the Key Elements of your teaching and learning environment, 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.

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

Attachment of the KCWP document is attached. NMES will focus on KCWP 4 and 5



ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



Key Core Work Processes

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 Key Core Work Process Documents		•
 Key Core Work Processes		• 6