

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10012018_14:37

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Zoneton Middle School
Ann Ford
797 Old Preston Hwy N
Shepherdsville, Kentucky, 40165
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/31/2018
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
Protocol	4
Current State	5
Priorities/Concerns	6
Trends	7
Potential Source of Problem.....	8
Strengths/Leverages	9
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	10

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

Rationale: 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 (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 (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. As required by Section 1008 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools must base their program upon a thorough 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?

Data results are analyzed by these committees and stakeholders: The Administration Team, The Academic and Behavior Response to Intervention Team/Instructional Leadership Team, Grade Level Summit Teams, Content PLCs, School-Based Decision-Making Committee. The Administration Team consists of Ann Ford (principal), Fin Burton (assistant principal), Debbie Burford (counselor and PBIS coach), and Ondrea Smallwood (Instructional Coach). The AT meets weekly. Electronic Notes are taken by the principal. The team analyzes academic, behavior, and summit (a personalized learning computer-based program) data to determine next steps for the ABRI/ILT committee, faculty meetings, teacher planning days, and PLC (Professional Learning Communities) next steps. The ABRI/ILT consists of the AT, team leaders, a University of Louisville representative, and an at-large member. Data is collected, organized into charts and graphs, and presented to the committee for analysis. An agenda is prepared by the PBIS coach and minutes are taken by the principal. The data is used to determine school-wide decisions and the team leaders relay this back to the teachers on each grade level team. Grade Level Summit Teams consist of all the teachers in a grade and meet every two weeks. They meet to analyze the percentage of focus areas passed by students and to determine small groups for cognitive skills work. Notes are kept by the team leaders. Content PLCs meet weekly to address the four PLC questions (what do we need them to know, how will we know they learned it, what do we do for the students who do not know it, what do we do to enhance for the ones who do know it). PLCs analyze assessment and project data to determine small group work needed. A teacher completes a PLC analysis worksheet and it is reviewed by the Instructional Coach. The SBDM acts as a liason between the staff and parents to increase student achievement through assessment data and non-cognitive data. An agenda is created by the SBDM chairperson (principal) and minutes are taken by the SBDM secretary (principal).

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

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:

- 32% of gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among gap students in Reading from 2017 to 2018.
- 34% of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 47%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 87% for the 2017 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2016.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2018 from 276 in 2017.

Current Academic State based on 2017-2018 KPREP: Reading Proficient/Distinguished Scores stayed the same from 2016-2017 at 49.9% (10.1% less than the state average) Reading Novice Scores - 2017-2018 23.4% of all students were Novice, an increase of 4.6 over 2016-17(4.2% higher than the state average) Math P/D scores for 2017-2018 were 37.9% which was a decrease of 10.9% from the previous year and less 7.1% from the state average. Math Novice scores were 16.6%, an increase of 0.9% from 16-17 and 2.4% higher than the state. An area of growth includes 8th-grade reading: 53% of students were P/D and 20% novice (a 3.1% increase in P/D and a 2% decrease in Novice) Another area of growth includes Sixth-grade math scores: 45% of student were P/D (an increase of 1.1%) and 14% Novice (a decrease of 4.9%) Lastly, Social Studies had 9.7% novice, which is a decrease of 0.4%. There is a definite deficit in the Reading and Math KPREP scores of all students and students with disabilities with a gap of 31% in reading and 26.6% in math. RTI numbers for 2017-2018 ranged from 40-75 students. After restructuring RTI to more accurately meet Tier I, II, and III definitions, we have seen a decrease in 2018-2019 first quarter with 38 RTI students in Reading and 39 students in RTI Math. 2017-2018 MAP data shows an increase of 4.5% Novice students from Fall 2017 to Spring 2018 for Reading. Data shows a decrease of 5.9% P/D. Math data shows a similar trend of an increase of 2.1% and a decrease in proficient of 6.8%. An area of growth was in 6th grade Math where novice decreased 12.03% from Winter to Spring and P/D increased 5.1% overall. The attendance goal for 2017-2018 was 96%. The percentage for the year was 94.38%, which was a decrease of 0.87% from the 2016-2017 school year. Teacher turn-over was less than 10%. Behavior Referrals increased from 164 to 339. Volunteer Hours decreased from 3255 to 2461. TELL Survey areas of growth include students following rules (50% of teachers feel students do not follow rules). Other areas of the TELL survey were over 60%.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data points.

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

Areas of weakness: Students with disabilities scored significantly lower than all students. In reading, SWD scored 18.9% P/D while all students scored 49.9%. In math, SWD scored 11.3% P/D while all students scored 37.9%. Another area of weakness is our Positive Behavior initiatives. Behavior referrals are up 175 and 50% of teachers do not feel students follow the rules. Lastly, parent involvement is down as demonstrated by volunteer hours decreasing 794 hours.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Trends

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

Our students with disabilities, community relations, and behavior remain the significant areas for improvement. Stakeholders must decrease the gap between SWD and all students, build positive community relations so that all stakeholders feel involved in the decision-making process, and ensure PBIS are in place so that optimum teaching conditions and a positive school climate are exuded. The trend data for students with disabilities show a decrease in Reading Novice over a three-year period from 2015 to 2017. The percentage for 2018 showed a slight increase but still less than the state average: 57.1% (2015), 57.4% (2016), 40.8% (2016), 43.4% (2017). The state average for 2017 was 47.8%. Proficient reading data for SWD was at a four year high of 17% but distinguished was down, therefore P/D is the 2nd highest in a 4-year period: 14.3% (2015), 22.2% (2016), 12.2% (2017), 18.9% (2018). Math data for novice SWD was similar to Reading novice data. Novice math data for SWD decreased to its lowest over the four year period: 55.6% (2015), 40.7% (2016), 44.9% (2017), 39.6% (2018). Math P/D decreased over the four-year period from the 2016 percentage of 18.5 to 11.3% for 2018. Writing data for SWD show novice above the state average and P/D below the state average: SWD in 2018 novice 64.7% (state 48.3%) and P/D 5.9% (state 11.0%) According to the 2017 TELL Survey, 60% of teachers feel parents support teachers. Comments from the Title I Parent Survey were of a similar nature when asked about communication between ESS teachers and parents for student progress: 33% felt they were not informed either by report, telephone, or conference. Further comments from parents suggest they would like more activities that involve parents. The low turnout for SBDM voting also suggests more community involvement is needed: 2 voting parents in 2017 and 3 voting parents in 2018. The TELL survey indicated only 50% of our teachers feel students follow rules. Analysis of discipline data from Infinite Campus also show an increase in discipline issues with an increase of 175 referrals from 2017 to 2018.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

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](#)

Growth in Reading, Math, Science, Writing/Decrease in gap for Students with Disabilities, and Behavior Modification: School leaders and teachers are continuing to refine the PLC process through professional learning and monitoring of the system by school leadership. This process will lead to a more aligned curriculum, stronger collaboration among stakeholders, the ability to analyze data, and use it to make informed decisions on daily practices. Standards were aligned to the Summit PLT and project platform to ensure students are reaching mastery on grade level content standards. During the 2018 school year, teachers have or will attend the following professional learning opportunities in writing, reading, math, special education, science, and behavior. These professional learning opportunities allow teachers to learn and grow alongside other educators to ensure the best practices and research-based strategies are implemented in the classroom to grow students academically in writing, reading, math, and science. Professional Learning will include The Ron Clark Academy, KCEC Conference, KCMT Conference, Writing and Literacy Project at U of L. Classroom resources for Science TCT practice, Social Studies Document Based Question Writing, and Why Try for behavior interventions have been purchased. Teachers use department level PLCs to determine implementation in the classroom. Decrease Gap for SWD: During the 2018 school year, the special education teachers will have a common planning period so that they may work as a PLC. During this time, teachers will ensure consistency of progress monitoring and ensure the consistency of the implementation of specially design instruction. This process will allow teachers to assess students' current abilities and intentionally plan SDI and SAS for their growth. Community Building: During the 2018 school year, all stakeholders will build positive and collaborating relationships by attending evening events intentionally planned to educate parents, conference with teachers, and showcase student academic growth. Other opportunities to collaborate with community agencies will include policemen and firemen events with students, chamber of commerce participation by the school, and continued participation in community projects that provide students' the opportunity to give back to the community. Behavior: ZMS will continue to collaborate with the U of L to monitor academic and behavior data through the ABRI committee. ZMS has also revised the classroom and office referral so that there is a clear distinction between the two and the behaviors are clearly defined for teachers, students, and parents. The MTSS process is being revised so that the interventions are more clearly defined within the Tier System. The In School Suspension Process has been revised so that the ISAP classroom is more isolated, the layout of the room is more structured, students sign a contract saying they will adhere to the rules, and breaks are intentionally scheduled. This will ensure a more dedicated space resulting in less disruptions and distractions for the ISAP teacher to monitor and mentor students who display repeated negative behaviors.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data.

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

As a Title I school, we are seeing growth in 8th grade reading with the percentage of P/D increasing from 49.9% to 53% and novice decreasing from 22% to 20%. There was growth in 6th-grade math with the percentage of P/D increasing from 43.9% to 45% and novice decreasing from 18.9% to 14%. Our trend is showing 49.9% of all students are P/D, which is higher than 2015-2017 (38.6%, 49.3% 49.3%). The 6th-grade failure rate was 0%. Our free and reduced population is not showing a significant gap in P/D with Reading novice at 28.5% (all students 23.4%); proficient is 37.9% (all students 40.8%) and this is highest in a 3-year trend (29.8%, 36.1%, 34.9%). Math free and reduced distinguished students are 5.5% congruent to 2017 of 5.6%.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY

Attachment Name	Description	Item(s)
ABRI/ILT Meeting Agenda and Notes	The agenda and notes taken demonstrate the goals the committee have set for the school year.	
Faculty Meeting Agenda	The agenda is for the September faculty meeting where KPREP data was viewed and explained.	
SBDM Minutes August 2018	SBDM Minutes	