2020-21 Phase Two: OCMS Needs Assessment for Schools

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Oldham County Middle School
Matthew Jacobson
4305 Brown Blvd.
Lagrange, Kentucky, 40031
United States of America

©Cognia, Inc.

Table of Contents

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?

Oldham County Middle School has an intricate teacher-leadership system. Within our school, we have behavior and academic leaders at all grade levels, Related Arts and our ECS team. These leaders, along with administrators, counselors and coaches make up both our Academic and Behavior Coalitions. This coalitions analyze various elements, including trends and areas of concern. Every other week, these leaders facilitate grade level meetings that are focused on data from their specific grade levels. Every other week, the meeting takes on a behavior and an academic focus. At these meetings, teachers and staff are able to look at students academic and behavior progress at an individual level. These teams determine if students are in need of academic or behavior intervention, that information is then passed to the grade level principal and counselor for next steps. Over this whole process is our MTSS team, which is comprised of administrators, counselors, behavior/academic leaders, instructional coaches and Library Media Specialist. This team reviews schoolwide data, which includes all referral and behavior data as well as big school data from standardized testing. Based on these pieces of data, this team sets both academic and behavior goals/direction for the building. These directions are then passed to our coalitions who are responsible for planning and implementing future plans.

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.

Due to COVID-19, OCMS did not participate in standardized testing in the Spring of 2020. Students did not take KPREP or MAP tests as they normally would in the Spring. The data below is the MAP data from Fall 2019, Winter 2020 and Fall 2020. Data that we are also following is the KPREP data on last years Needs Assessment as we haven't taken KPREP since that point. KPREP: There was consistent growth in the NAPD between 2018 data and 2019 data with reading increasing from 79.4 to 83, Math from 70.5 to 72.6, and Sciences from 56.4 to 58.3. The trend line for our students score proficient and distinguished continues to point upward and reflects the highest percentage of PD students in the last 5 years. In reading, students grew to 66.6 P/D up from 60% and in math at 51% which is up from 48%. In Reading, students with an IEP scored at 35.6% P/D, up from 22.5% in 2018. The gap between disabled and non-disabled students closed by 9 points. In Math, students with an IEP scored at 20% P/D, up from 12.5% in 2018. The gap between disabled and non-disabled students closed by 5 points. Impact Kentucky Survey (Spring 2020): 54% of teachers responded favorably to how discipline is handled in the building, this is down from 68% in the 2019 survey. 62% of teachers responded favorably to questions about school climate and the overall health of the building. 62% of teachers responded favorably regarding the feedback and coaching they receive

through observations. This survey was taken with former administration and is difficult to compare to the 2019 survey. We will survey teachers multiple times during the school year to determine our progress regarding staff feedback. MAP Data: A review of our Fall 2020 MAP test, compared to the Winter 19/20 MAP test indicates that as a school, the percent of students scoring Novice in Reading fell from 17.2% to 15.9%. The Percent of students scoring proficient and distinguished increased from 62.2% to 64.2%. These are important metrics as they indicate the time students were in NTI due to COVID-19. It is encouraging to see that as a school, we saw a overall decrease in novice and an increase in proficient/distinguished scores. In math, as a school our students scoring Novice increased from 10.4% to 12%. The percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished dropped from 53.3% to 51.4%. Math continues to be a concern based on growth data over the last couple of years. Based on school conditional growth percentile, the 6th-8th grade have all experienced low growth in math, while showing high growth in two areas in reading.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

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.

Writing continues to be our largest area of concern, without KPREP data in the Spring of 2020, it is difficult to determine our growth. Writers scoring P/D fell in 2018 from 45.2 to 28.5. The percentage of students who scored novice rose from 17.8 to 28.1. In our GAP groups, the overall proficiency of any of those gaps was low including no disabled students score proficient. Moving forward, a concern and a priority for us as a school is to continue to address our need for more training on remote learning. The concern of or GAP growing due to COVID is a concern and a priority for us. All students are experience less instruction due to COVID, but we know that the GAP for our students at risk is growing more quickly. MAP data shows that students in poverty scored below the Mean RIT across all three grade levels. The same is true for math. We know that our GAP groups are more likely to struggle on these assessments. Moving forward it is a concern that these students will fall farther behind.

Trends

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

Without reliable data from the Spring of 2020, we have a hole in our trend data. As of 2019, the trend line for our students who were scoring proficient and distinguished was slightly upward and represented the highest percentage of P/D students in the last 5 years in both reading and math. MAP data indicates that the GAP is closing in the area of reading and students in the 6th and 8th grade are growing at a percentile that is considered high growth. Math scores are not growing, in fact they show a low growth rate based on percentile.

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

With regards to writing, we will continue to use the ELA curriculum frameworks to guide teachers on designing and deploying standards to highly rigorous level as well as incorporating balanced assessments (KCW3). KCWP 2 and 1 will be revisited multiple times within our writing plans, ensuring teachers are selecting the correct materials, standards, activities to embed our writing instruction within. Focusing on reviewing CFA data and getting a clear picture of where are students are after this non-traditional school year will be very important. We will need to analyze standardized data and CFA data (KCWP 4) and align proper remediation, intervention and instruction (KCWP 5) to ensure that we close the gaps that are being created during NTI and the disfunction of this school year. We will continue to work hard in establishing a learning culture that is rigorous and meets the needs of all students (KCWP 6). One potential problem with math is that it has at times taken second place to Reading. If a student struggles to meet grade level standards in math AND reading, they are provided support in reading first. Secondly, our math department has experienced a high turnover rate the last 2-3 years. We have many new math teachers, teachers who haven't been through our literacy camps or math data dives.

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%.

KPREP: In reading, students grew to 66.6% P/D up from 60% and in math at 51% which is up from 48%. Every grade level cohort also made gains as they progressed through the years. In Reading, disabled students scored at 35.6% PD up from 22.5% in 2018. The gap between Disabled and non-disabled students closed by 9 points. In Math, students with an IEP scored at 20% PD up from 12.5% in 2018. The gap between Disabled and non-disabled students closed by 5 points. Novice scores dropped from 16.7-13.3 in reading and 13.7-12.6 in math. MAP: MAP data shows that our growth in reading was sustained through NTI and COVID. The things that we have in place to identify struggling students and then provide support to help them improve are working. We need to implement very similar procedures for math. This includes creating consistency in the math department and providing opportunities for teachers to examine student data and place students in spots where they can receive additional support.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
KPREP Data Guide - 2019	KPREP Data Guide for the 2018-2019 school year. This is the last compilation of data that we have due to COVID 19.	•