



2024-2025 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_10292024_09:56

2024-2025 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Oakland Elementary
Shaun Stice
2494 Church St.
Oakland, Kentucky, 42159
United States of America

Table of Contents

2024-2025 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Attachment Summary	12

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.

KSA state assessment data of individual scores were shared and analyzed with grade level teachers on September 27, 2024. Teachers determined which students were close to performing at the next performance indicator and how they can ensure students will perform at the next level. Overall state assessment was shared with faculty and staff on October 2, 2024. Our leadership team consisting of the principal, ECC and instructional coach participated in a studying your scores session with the district on October 30, 2024. Detailed analysis of data and trends will be shared on November 4th during our PLC day.

Summative and formative assessment is shared throughout the school year.

Weekly PLCs are conducted and student data is analyzed to determine areas of success and areas in need of reteaching. i-Ready individualized learning paths in Reading and Math, and Amira reports are also analyzed to see the needs of

individual students. This information is shared with stakeholders as part of students' quarterly progress.

Academic Child Study Teams (CST) meet every other month to analyze i-Ready assessments, including Standards Mastery Assessments. Diagnostic assessments in i-Ready are given three times a year to determine student growth in Reading and Math. During CST meetings, interventions are discussed and plans developed to address student gaps in learning. Progress monitoring and literacy tasks are analyzed to determine next steps with students who have reading and math deficits, and for those who were indicated as needing a reading improvement plan based on the Read to Succeed Act (KRS.158.305). We analyze this data to determine students who would benefit with interventions and those who can exit interventions. With the assistance of our reading interventionist students may move from one tier to the next based on their progress monitoring. Our ECC, instructional coach, reading interventionist and homeroom teachers discuss which students will receive interventions in the classroom or if they need to be seen by our interventionist. Our reading intervention teacher also assists teachers in the classroom during center rotations and intervention time. Reading and math interventions are provided to students 45 minutes per day, 2x per week.

Child Study Team meetings also address who to invite to ESS. Our ESS began on October 15, 2024 and targeted students who had reading deficits and those who qualified as needing a reading plan. ESS will continue throughout the year until April 2025.

Our PBIS Tier 1 team meets monthly to review student behavior data and the implementation of our tier 1 action plan. Behavior child study teams meet monthly to discuss students in tier 2 and tier 3 interventions and review progress monitoring to determine interventions and supports for students. Behavior data is shared monthly with staff and with our SBDM council.

For input from our stakeholders, our school utilizes several surveys. Parents, students, and staff complete a Student engagement survey and a Leader In Me survey at least once per year. Surveys provide information on customer service, needs being met, and areas of improvement. Survey data is reviewed by the leadership team and action plans are developed and shared with stakeholders. Meetings and PLCs are documented through agendas, notes, and/or minutes.

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?

Objective 1 from last year's CSIP indicated the following: By May of 2024, Oakland Elementary will increase the reading and math indicator score from 36.2 to 39.82 as measured by state assessment. We did not obtain that goal.

Areas of focus for proficiency were to design and deliver instruction to improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction through the process of professional development, coaching, blended learning approach, and through engagement strategies.

Increase proficiency by reviewing and analyzing data in areas of math and reading to determine needs to provide explicit intervention to ensure students' learning toward the mastery of standards. Other strategies used are focused on ways to reduce barriers to learning such as implementing lessons that meet the intent and rigor of reading and math standards, also intentional scheduling for EL and special education students to ensure they are exposed to grade level content and rigor.

One other strategy used was establishing a learning culture and environment by providing opportunities for parent/teacher conferences, information sessions for parents that focused on literacy, math, STEM, and also implementation of student data notebooks that obtained academic student WIGS and progress toward those goals.

In the area of separate academic indicator, our school's objective was to increase the combined writing indicator score from 56.7 to 62.37 by May 2024. We did not meet this goal. The strategies used were to design and deliver high quality instruction by implementing a school wide writing guide and expectations while analyzing students writing in weekly PLCs and providing specific feedback for students. We used this analysis to provide explicit, specialized instruction for students that were not meeting these goals.

Our area of focus in achievement gap were African American student group. Our objective was to increase the reading/math indicator in the African American student group from 23.4 to 26.74 by May 2024. We did exceed that goal. The strategies used to obtain this goal was focusing on tier 1 instruction by implementing language comprehension and word recognition strategies to build connections and strengthening reading comprehension. Strategies also included development of lessons around the interdisciplinary literacy practices, KAS standards, and intentionally ensured read-alouds included characters of African American culture.

Our other area of focus was in the area of economically disadvantaged. Our objective was to increase the reading/math indicator score from 34.5 to 37.95 by May 2024. We did not meet this goal.

The plan from last year will assist us with this year's plan by seeing what was effective and what areas we need to research alternative strategies.

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.

Throughout the last few years all academic areas are an area of concern. Our school received growth in writing proficiency from the previous state assessment as the scores increase from 22% P/D to 27% P/D. Math proficiency scores stayed the same at 14% P/D. All other academic areas saw a slight decrease in the percentage of P/D. The EL population continues to show growth on the Access test from the previous year.

Focus in regard to gap groups was around special populations and African American students. From the 2022/2023 KSA data our scores for African American students identified our school as a TSI school. However, the increased percentage of P/D for African American students on the 2023/2024 KSA data allowed our school to come out TSI status.

PBIS is implemented in our school, and our daily schedule set time aside for social emotional learning. However, behavior referrals have been a significant issue over the past few years. There has been an increase in office referrals over the past couple of years with 305 ODRs in 2022/2023 school year to 390 ODRs in 2023/2024. The behavior of certain students is impeding the learning of others. Disruptive behavior is the result of a lack of student engagement, the need for differentiated instruction, and the need for consistent social emotional instruction.

Another factor is the transient student population and the impact of trauma. This could be characterized by low social economic status of our student population.

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.

Current academic performance:

KSA 2023/2023-In the area of reading, please see the following breakdown for all grades:

- 27% P/D
- 34% Apprentice
- 39% Novice

In the area of math, please see the following breakdown for all grades:

- 13% P/D
- 35% Apprentice
- 51% Novice

In the area of science, please see the following breakdown for all grades:

- 15 % P/D
- 57 % Apprentice
- 28 % Novice

In the area of Social Studies, please see the following breakdown for all grades:

- 18% P/D
- 30% Apprentice
- 52% Novice

In the area of Combined Writing, please see the following breakdown for all grades:

- 25 % P/D
- 52 % Apprentice
- 23 % Novice

The growth of English Language Learners of their Access test scores are as follows:

- 21% receiving a score of 140
- 17% receiving a score of 100
- 0% receiving a score of 80
- 38% receiving a score of 60
- 24% receiving a score of 0

On the school climate and safety area, our school received the following scores:

- Safety Index of 66.9

-
- Climate Index of 72.3
 - Quality of school climate and safety indicator - 67.8

Due to the significant increase in performance by our African American students, our school is no longer identified as TSI. However, we will continue to monitor students to ensure instruction is differentiated to meet the needs of these students.

Reading and math scores that are analyzed in PLCs and during district PLC days come from our universal diagnostic screener, i-Ready. Our current reading scores from the beginning of the year screener indicate that 20% of students are a middle/above grade level; 47% of students are on grade level; 18% of students are 2 grade levels below; and 16% of students are 3 or more grade levels below.

Our current math scores from the beginning of the year screener indicate that 8% of students are middle/above grade level; 55% of students are on grade level, 20% of students are 2 grade levels below; and 17% of students are 3 or more grade levels below.

Non-Academic Current State: There has been a significant decrease in referrals from last year at this time. For the months of August, September, and October in 2023 there were 86 referrals. Currently, we have had 57 office discipline referrals.

In looking at current behavior interventions, our school has 2% of students in Tier 3; 8% of students in Tier 2; and 90% of students in Tier 1.

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.

Concerns are noted in all academic areas. However, since literacy proficiency is critical in all academic areas, reading, writing and math are the areas of most concern at this time based on KSA 2023/2024. 39% of students scored novice in reading, 51% of students scored novice in math. 23% of students scored novice in combined writing.

Increased teacher knowledge of math pedagogy and the delivery of instruction from conceptual to abstract understanding of math skills and concepts are priorities based on this year's beginning of the year diagnostic screener. As well as ensuring

teachers are making sure lessons in all academic areas are engaging and meeting the rigor of the standards.

Current behavior data is demonstrating a decrease in office referrals, so positive implementation of PBIS and daily SEL lessons will continue to decrease ODRs.

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.

In the area of writing, our KSA scores continue to increase from 3% P/D in 2021/2022 to 22% P/D in 2022/2023 to 25% in 2023/2024. We also had 52% of students who scored apprentice in 2023/2024. Through the use of school wide writing expectations and the use of writing structures our scores are improving.

Our African American students showed significant growth in reading by increasing proficiency from 15% to 30%. By ensuring we are individualizing instruction and meeting the needs of all learners scores increased.

Areas of concern of non-academic areas are behavior referrals and school culture. Through the use of PBIS and the Leader in Me initiative to become Lighthouse status these areas will demonstrate positive growth for our school.

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

 OES Key Elements Template

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 2: Design & Deliver Instruction: Through walkthroughs and observations, the leadership team will ensure Tier I instruction meets the intent of the state standards and teachers are utilizing evidence-based instructional practices (e.g., modeling, discussion, questioning, feedback) to ensure cognitive engagement. When students aren't successful on standards mastery and common assessments, teacher will take the time to re-teach, give feedback and allow students to make corrections to ensure that at least 80% of students have their instructional needs met through Tier I, universal instruction with an intentional use of scaffolding and differentiation. The PBIS team will meet monthly and conduct walkthroughs during the SEL scheduled time to ensure teachers design lessons aligned with Leader in Me and are relevant and responsive to students' cultural, social, and developmental needs.

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data: Weekly PLCs that analyze i-Ready data will ensure that teachers elicit, interpret and act on student learning results to inform instructional decision making. Collaboration among teachers and reading interventionist will ensure data is used to meet the needs of all students (e.g., movement through the tiers of intervention, grouping/regrouping, teacher and student placement, scheduling) Leadership/data notebooks and grade level scoreboards are in place to ensure that students are actively involved in knowing their own data and making decisions about their own learning.

KCWP 6: Establishing a learning culture and environment: Our focus with leadership, culture, and academics will be driven through the implementation of the Leader in Me at a level to become Lighthouse status. PBIS, Lighthouse teams and action teams are in place to promote shared leadership among stakeholders in order to elevate a positive and supportive culture for learning and to develop the collective efficacy of the staff so that teams are highly effective. Through the establishment of various clubs such as Leading Ladies, Boys to Men, Student Council and Student Lighthouse teams an equitable environment where students collaborate, celebrate one another's differences, and are motivated to learn as valued members of the classroom community is evolving. Classroom cultures support the development of self-directed learners through leadership/data notebooks, student led conferences, and through goal setting.

Attachment Summary

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