



2024-2025 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10312024_12:30

2024-2025 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

James T Alton Middle School
Danielle Cassady
100 Country Club Road
Vine Grove, Kentucky, 40175
United States of America

Table of Contents

2024-2025 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Attachment Summary	10

2024-2025 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 they will address 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 as you conducted 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 were documented.

James T. Alton Middle School utilizes data and the results for improving teacher instruction and student learning. The PEG writing program is used for progress monitoring in writing. Language arts teachers use this data to pinpoint skill deficits and to create mini-lessons to address problems of practice. JTA also uses IReady data to monitor student progress in reading and math. The students take the initial diagnostic in the fall, and then there are two follow-up diagnostics administered in the winter and the spring. The results of these diagnostics are used to monitor student growth over the course of the year and to place students in necessary intervention classes or ESS to recoup lost skills. This assessment data is also shared with all stakeholders, including our SBDM council throughout the year. KSA state assessment data was recently released. This information will be shared with all stakeholders, including the SBDM council. Teachers, in collaboration with administrators, will analyze the results of this data in PLCs and will continue to do so throughout the year. In PLCs, teachers look for trends in the data and examine instructional strategies that have worked for groups of students as well as

individuals. They collaborate to improve instruction by examining alignment to the standards, rigor, and the effect size of different instructional strategies. Particular attention is paid to gap groups and strategies that can be used to increase their growth. All individual student scores (PEG, KSA, IReady) are shared with students and parents. The information is sent home with progress reports and/or grade cards. Parents also have the opportunity on parent/teacher nights to go over the assessment scores and compare to past years data and grade level benchmarks. Students receive goal setting sheets in the fall and meet with their reading and math teachers to set realistic goals for improvement. In the Fall and Spring, every student will have a conference with an administrator to goal set for the end of year state assessment. Administration also keeps track of students who are failing and in need of academic interventions for credit recovery; this list is updated weekly. A/B honor roll is calculated every trimester. In addition to achievement data, JTA looks at behavior/discipline data, attendance, and grades routinely. Our PBIS committee meets monthly to go over student data and plan incentives to improve in these areas. In addition, they look at individual student behavior to determine a "best fit" intervention for students in need of supplemental instruction in behavior. Administration works closely with our Youth Service Center Coordinator to plan our truancy diversion program to improve attendance. Students complete a social emotional wellness survey at the beginning of the year. The results of that survey, combined with Universal Screener data and feedback from the counseling office are used to determine counseling interventions for students.

Review of Previous Plan

2. Summarize the implementation of the goals, objectives, strategies and activities from the previous year's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP). What was successful? How does it inform this year's plan?

Goal 1 was to increase the percentage of students proficient in reading and math.

We used district ESSER money to allocate a reading and math interventionist to deliver targeted interventions to students who were below the 16th percentile. Reading and math teachers completed progress monitoring for all students using the IReady MyPath program in the general ed. classroom. They used this data to set goals with students routinely. Achievement data was collected through IReady and state assessments and teachers analyzed that data in PLCS to determine how the data would impact their instruction. Unfortunately, we were not able to achieve this goal. In reading our scores went down slightly by 0.7%. The toll in math was much greater due to the loss of half of our math staff mid-year. Math scores went down 6.2%.

Goal 2 was to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in science, social studies, and combined writing. To do this, we implemented monthly team PLCs where teachers could discuss instructional strategies and analyze student data to inform instruction in their classrooms as well as ensure alignment between standards, learning targets, and assessment measures. Unfortunately our scores declined in all areas. In science, our scores went down by 6.9%. In social studies, our scores went down 5.7%, and in combined writing, our scores went down 11.5%.

Our next goal was to reduce the number of students with IEPs scoring novice in reading and math. To address this, we focused on providing professional development to collaborative teams to improve instruction in the collab classroom. Teachers were given time to plan and were provided with planning strategies and collaborative models. Time in SpEd. PLCs was spent on improving instruction rather than housekeeping issues. Special education teachers were trained in Orton Gillingham strategies to increase reading comprehension and fluency. Our schedule was amended to focus special education teachers in content areas, rather than attaching them to teams and having them follow the same group of students from class to class. The hope was that special education teachers would become more comfortable with content standards and would have more time to plan with gen. ed. teachers for SDI. We also looked closely at the number of students who were receiving resource classes in science and social studies to determine if they could be mainstreamed into the general education classroom. We were able to accomplish this LRE change for many students, which ensured access to a content specialist. The goal was to reduce the percentage of students with IEPs scoring novice to 20% or less in both reading and math. While we were able to reduce the percentage of students scoring novice in both reading and math, unfortunately we are still not close to achieving this goal. In reading we still have 51% of students with IEPs scoring novice, and in math 52 %. Clearly, much more work needs to be done in this area.

Finally our last goal was to increase our school climate indicator by 2 points and our school safety indicator by 4 points. To do this we surveyed teachers, parents, and students periodically throughout the year to receive feedback and recommendations to improve school climate. We also collaborated with parents, students, staff, and local law enforcement to improve safety measures. For example, we replaced all of our locks to the outside doors to enable key fob entrance for staff, and we wrapped our windows and doors to provide added security by diminishing visibility from the outside. We also made sure that every classroom was labeled with the teacher's name and room number. Unfortunately, this did not produce the results we were hoping for. Our school climate score went down by 4.1 and our safety score went down by 3.1.

Trends

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

Example of Trends

- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2022-2023 to 288 in 2023-2024.
- From 2022 to 2024, the school saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.

The number of behavior referrals increased to 1,800 referrals in 2023. This is mostly due to the fact that we implemented a new PBIS system which tracks school-wide points for students and requires students to see an administrator once they reach their 5th point. While this system does generate more behavior referrals, we

are seeing a decline in the number of serious offenses because students are seen earlier and more often, and staff is able to intervene quicker with an appropriate intervention.

Last year's overall attendance rate was 94.12% for the year. Already this year we are seeing an increase in attendance. So far JTA has about at 95% attendance rate for the 2023-2024 academic year

The overall mean on the employee engagement survey went down last year. At the end of 2023 the mean on the Studer teacher engagement survey was a 4.33; that score at the end of 2024 was 3.45. The lowest scoring areas were in allocation of resources and regular exchange of ideas. The overall mean on the parent satisfaction survey also went down over the last year. In 2023 the average mean for the family engagement survey was 3.81. For 2024 that mean went down to 3.35. The lowest scoring areas remain consistent, with parents indicating that they wish for more communication from school to home about how their children are doing academically (3.10), and they wish for more positive communication (2.88).

Academically, even though this last year's KSA scores are lower than the previous year, overall scores for the last 4 years are trending up in math and social studies. Science and reading are pretty stagnant, and combined writing is trending down. The actual performance of students scoring on grade level as measured by the IReady diagnostic went up 14.67% in reading to 37.66% and from 17.67% in math to 24%.

Our scores for students with IEPs as measured by KSA did go up this year, and we were able to remove our TSI classification for students with IEPs last year, and we still have no classification this year. However, as mentioned before, there is still a significant gap between students with disabilities and their peers. This is an area in which we will continue to strive for improvement.

Current State

4. Describe in narrative form the current state 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 Kentucky Summative Assessment (KSA) in reading. Local benchmark data indicates that thirty-two percent of all students receive Tier II intervention in reading.
- Fifty-four percent of our students scored proficient in math on the KSA compared to the state average of 57%. Local formative assessments show 53% of students are on grade level in math.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2023-2024 academic year. 2022-2023 Impact survey data shows that 71% of staff feel like they belong at our school.
- Survey results and perception data indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

The overall attendance rate for students last year was 93.87, which was down from the previous year, 94.12%. So far this year, our attendance rate is slightly higher at 94.56%. Staff attendance last year was 93.87, which is up from the previous year, 92.55. So far this year, staff attendance is 93.84%. This is still lower than we would like, but it is trending in the positive direction. We currently have 1 retired teacher who is filling a certified staffing position. We also have 2 long-term substitutes who are not yet certified and 1 teacher who will soon go on maternity leave. The combined reading and math scores as measured by the KSA end of year assessment went down this year for all students by 3.5, with the status going from a 58.6 to 55.1. Math scores went down from 55.8 to 49.6 for an overall decrease of 6.2 points. Reading also went down slightly by 0.7 points. Reading scores went from 61.3 to 60.6. This is concerning considering the district was able to maintain their score. The bright spot to our KSA scores this year were with special education students. JTA was able to show an increase in its students with IEPs. In reading and math, special education scored 40.3 overall. IN reading, students with IEPs reaching proficiency increasy 6%, and in math they showed an increase of 2%. Science, social studies and writing went up to 53.4. Their overall score went from 34.3 to a 47.6, for an overall gain of 13.3, which is a significant gain. IReady has been our constant measure of student achievement for the last 3 years because KPREP was not mandatory in 2021. As of the last IReady diagnostic that was administered in August, 36% of our students are on grade level in reading, and 20% are on grade level in math. The breakdown of reading scores is 6th grade = 37% proficient; 7th grade = 43% proficient; and 8th grade = 29% proficient. The breakdown of math scores is 6th grade = 22% proficient; 7th grade = 25% proficient; and 8th grade = 13% proficient. Last year students in math were able to increase the percent of students on grade level by 12% from the beginning of the year to the end. In reading, students were also able to increase the percentage of students on grade level by almost 13%. The performance of our disability with IEP group and African American students is still a major concern. They continue to under perform compared to all students. We are examining data in PLCs and looking at best practice strategies to improve instruction for ALL students. We are also examining IEPs, modifications and accommodations, placement, and teacher expectations for our disability population.

Priorities/Concerns

5. Clearly and concisely describe the two or three greatest areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

NOTE: You must thoroughly address these priorities in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template.

Example: Students in our gap groups are scoring significantly below all students. Sixty-eight percent of students in the achievement gapscored below proficiency on the Kentucky Summat gap learners.

Students with IEPs are still scoring significantly lower than all students in reading and math, with disability students scoring 37.3 compared to all students who scored 55.1. African American students are also a concern for JTA. They scored 36.5 in reading and math compared to the 55.1 of all students. This trend continues in science, social studies, and writing for African Americans, but not for special education students. In these areas, African American students are scoring 29.5, compared to all students who scored 45.5.

In addition to these numbers, all of our overall scores went down this year, which is concerning. I believe this is due to the increase in teacher absences and mid-year turnover as well as the number of substitutes we had to use. Teacher absenteeism is a huge concern for us, especially among special education teachers. We are working to improve school climate by initiating more faculty and student culture events as well as improving relationships with students to help with absenteeism.

Strengths/Leverages

6. Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school. Explain how the school will utilize the strengths and leverages 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 most recent KPREP data indicates the following: JTA outperformed the district and state's Proficient/Distinguished percentages in students with IEPs in combined reading and math. Our combined score is a 40.3, while the districts is 35.2. In combined social studies, science, and combined writing we are well above the district and state. Our score is actually higher for special education students than all students. Their score is 53.4, where the district score is 34.2.

Evaluate the Teaching and Learning Environment

7 . 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 Results

KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes

KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture

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 directly below.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



Key Elements 2024


8. After analyzing the Key Elements of your teaching and learning environment, which two or three 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: The Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template must thoroughly address these.

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

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 Key Elements 2024		• 7