

2019-20 Phase Two: NIS Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Newport Intermediate School

Dennis Maines
101 E. 4th St
Newport, Kentucky, 41071
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/20/2019

Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	4
Protocol	5
Current State	6
Priorities/Concerns	12
Trends	13
Potential Source of Problem.....	14
Strengths/Leverages	17
Attachment Summary	18

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 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/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. 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/district councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

Newport Intermediate School incorporates a team approach to data analysis and action. All certified teachers have served on the instructional leadership team in reviewing classroom data, state assessment data, and universal screening data. The school instructional leadership team was facilitated by the school Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, and Instructional Coach. All certified teachers met as a staff in the month of October on two separate occasions (October 1& 15). to analyze state assessment data by school, grade level, sub group, classroom level, and individual student. All certified teachers met in Professional Learning Communities once in September and again in October to make next step actions using a PDSA quality tool. The School Advisory Committee also reviewed the school assessment data and gave input on the needs assessment. All parents have also received initial notification of student data.

Newport Intermediate School Leadership team will be working with our families over the next two months to garner additional perception data and parent input in a holistic view of our learning community.

Data Source(s): 2018 Kprep, 2019 Kprep, Spring 2019 NWEA MAP, Fall 2019 NWEA MAP, Attendance data, Economic Data, Demographic Makeup, Safety Data, Tell Ky 17, Advance Ed Diagnostic Winter 2019, Title Intervention Program Data

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 (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (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 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

Current State: What Does the Data Tell Us? Academic State Newport Intermediate School received a 44.5 indicator score in the area of proficiency, 33.4 indicator score in separate academic, and a 49.5 indicator score in the area of growth. 2018/2019 shows the Hispanic and ELL population growing at a higher rate than any other non-duplicated gap group. 3rd Grade Reading Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 50.4, Apprentice 23.7, Proficiency & Distinguished 25.9 2018 Novice 59.7, Apprentice 24.8, Proficient & Distinguished 21.5 2018 to 2019 Novice percentages decreased 8.8%. Apprentice percentages decreased by 1.1%. Proficient and Distinguished increased by 4.4% NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 42% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 24% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 17% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 9% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 9% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 18% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile). NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 34% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 21% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 18% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 19% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 7% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 26% and decreased from the fall ranges of projection (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile). 3rd Grade Math 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 46.6, Apprentice 30.5, Proficiency & Distinguished 22.9 2018 Novice 30.6, Apprentice 40.5, Proficient & Distinguished 28.9 Novice percentages increased 16%. Apprentice percentages decreased by 10%. Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 6% NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows 32% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 31% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 16% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 18% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 3% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 21% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile) and is similar to the state assessment results. NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 33% of students

performing below the 21st percentile. 18% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 25% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 20% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 5% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile.

4th Grade Reading 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 47.4, Apprentice 31, Proficiency & Distinguished 21.5 2018 Novice 37.2, Apprentice 29.5, Proficient & Distinguished 33.3 Novice percentages increased 10.2%. Apprentice percentages increased by 1.5%. Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 11.8% Growth data reveals that 17.27% of students maintained the same performance level. 20% of students grew to the next performance level. 10% of students grew two performance levels. 3.64% of students grew three performance levels. .91% of students grew four performance levels.

NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows 38% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 20% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 19% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 20% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 3% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 23% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile) and is similar to the state assessment results.

NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 42% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 27% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 10% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 14% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 7% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile.

4th Grade Math 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 42.2, Apprentice 38.8, Proficiency & Distinguished 18.9 2018 Novice 27.9, Apprentice 34.9, Proficient & Distinguished 37.2 Novice percentages increased 14.3%. Apprentice percentages increased by 3.9%. Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 18.3% Growth data reveals that 24.55% of students maintained the same performance level. 13.64% of students grew to the next performance level. 4.55% of students grew two performance levels.

NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows 40% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 23% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 19% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 16% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 2% of students performed in the high range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 18% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile) and is similar to the state assessment results.

NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 49% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 16% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 18% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 13% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 4% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile.

4th Grade Science 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 46.6, Apprentice 48.3, Proficiency & Distinguished 5.2 2018 Novice 36.8, Apprentice 48, Proficient & Distinguished 15.2 Novice percentages increased by 9.8% Apprentice percentages increased by .3% Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 10%

5th Grade Reading 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 35.3, Apprentice 26.1, Proficiency & Distinguished 38.6 2018 Novice 32.8, Apprentice 26.9, Proficient & Distinguished 40.3 Novice percentages increased 2.5%. Apprentice percentages decreased by 0.8%. Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 1.7% Growth data reveals that 26.72% of students maintained the same performance level. 18.10% of students grew to the next performance level. 8.62% of students grew two performance levels. 6.03% of students grew three performance levels.

NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows 26% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 19% of students performed within the low average range between the

21st and 40th percentile. 24% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 25% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 6% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 31% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile) and is slightly similar to the state assessment results. NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 43% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 19% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 12% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 23% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 4% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. 5th Grade Math 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 33.6, Apprentice 38.7, Proficiency & Distinguished 27.7 2018 Novice 32.8, Apprentice 42.9, Proficient & Distinguished 24.4 Novice percentages increased 0.8%. Apprentice percentages decreased by 4.2%. Proficient and Distinguished increased by 3.3% Growth data reveals that 37.93% of students maintained the same performance level. 11.21% of students grew to the next performance level. 6.9% of students grew two performance levels. 1.72% of students grew three performance levels. NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows 31% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 28% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 19% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 13% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 8% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 21% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile) and is slightly similar to the state assessment results. NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 45% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 19% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 17% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 18% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 1% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. 5th Grade Social Studies 2018 to 2019 - Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 35.3, Apprentice 41.2, Proficiency & Distinguished 23.5 2018 Novice 39.5, Apprentice 40.3, Proficient & Distinguished 20.1 Novice percentages decreased 4.2% Apprentice percentages increased by 0.9%. Proficient and Distinguished increased by 3.4% 5th Grade Writing 2018 to 2019 - Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 56.3, Apprentice 34.5, Proficiency & Distinguished 9.2 2018 Novice 40, Apprentice 47, Proficient & Distinguished 13.1 Novice percentages increased 16.3% Apprentice percentages decreased by 12.5%. Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 3.9% 6th Grade Reading 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 43.9, Apprentice 21.5, Proficiency & Distinguished 34.6, 2018 Novice 38.8, Apprentice 25.9, Proficient & Distinguished 35.3 Novice percentages increased 5.1%. Apprentice percentages decreased by 4.4%. Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 0.7% Growth data reveals that 28.16% of students maintained the same performance level. 18.45% of students grew to the next performance level. .97% of students grew two performance levels. 2.91% of students grew three performance levels. NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows 39% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 23% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 17% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 11% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 9% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 20% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile) and is not similar to the state assessment results which are 14.6% higher. NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 30% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 15% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 22% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th

percentile. 22% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 11% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. 6th Grade Math 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019 Novice 22.4 Apprentice 52.3 Proficiency & Distinguished 25.3 2018 Novice 15.5 Apprentice 50 Proficient & Distinguished 34.4 Novice percentages increased 6.9%. Apprentice percentages increased by 2.3%. Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 7.4% Growth data reveals that 30.10% of students maintained the same performance level. 28.16% of students grew to the next performance level. 11.65% of students grew two performance levels. 2.91% of students grew three performance levels. NWEA MAP Spring 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows 34% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 31% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 16% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 13% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 6% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. When examining this universal screener data projected proficiency stood near 19% (when utilizing data at and above the 61st percentile) and is slightly similar to the state assessment results. NWEA MAP Fall 19 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 35% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 22% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 23% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 13% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 7% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. 2018-2019 Title I and Other Grant Data Title 1 Funded program, Read 180/System 44 data reveals 55 students served in the program during the 18/19 school year. 43 Novice 43/55= 78% 9 Apprentice 19/55= 16% 3 Proficient and Distinguished 3/55= .05% Further data analysis shows: 31 Low novice students 14 High Novice Students 5 Low Apprentice 4 High Apprentice The SRI assessment is utilized to monitor growth within the program. This data reveals 3 students in the normal range growth (75-100pts in a year), 15 above range growth (over 100pts in a year), and 11 below range growth (0-75 points gained). Program analysis shows many students made gains in their lexile reading score, even though they were still not apprentice or proficient on the state assessment. Three students exited the program during the year because they were proficient on MAP assessment. Looking at these students again were apprentices or proficient on KPREP. Title and Grant funded Read to Achieve program revealed the following results. On spring MAP 2019 scores, four students were near apprentice level, while one student scored apprentice. There was an increased average of a 14 points in scores as measured through MAP when you compare fall scores to spring. When comparing KPREP average scores to fall MAP scores, there was an average increase of 18 points of growth in the RIT ranges. Students grew an average of six F and P levels throughout the year. Also, 71% of third grade students served by RTA were reading instructionally mid year third grade or higher by spring, according to their F and P scores. Non-Academic Current State 2018-2019 Student Demographic Data Newport Intermediate School serves students in grades 3 through 6 with a total population of 491 students. The school is a Title I eligible/schoolwide school with 93.1% of students found to be economically disadvantaged representing 457 students as compared to 34 students found to be not economically disadvantaged. 49.9% of the student population is White (non-Hispanic), 20.6% African American, 15.7% Hispanic or Latino, and 13.8% other. 8% of students are English Language Learners. 16% of the total population are students with disabilities with an IEP. 4.3% of students are identified as Gifted and Talented learners. 2018/2019 3rd grade represented the largest grade of students at Newport Intermediate with 158 students. 2018-2019 Attendance Data 12.8% of students at Newport Intermediate were rated as chronically absent. Homeless students received 28.8% chronically absent ratings. The overall attendance rate for 2018/2019 was 95.0%. 2018-2019 Learning Environment Data The student to teacher ratio is 13:1. 54.5% of teachers have a Bachelor's degree, 27.3 have earned a Master's degree, and 18.2% have earned a Rank 1. The average years of school experience is 8 with 17.5% of the teaching staff being in their first year.

Teacher turnover is at 45%. 2017 Tell Kentucky data shows 67.6% of certified staff agree/strongly agree that the community is engaged and supportive. 52.6% agreed/strongly agreed that leadership managed student conduct and 60.5% agreed/strongly agreed that school leadership was supportive. 2018-2019 Technology Data The student to computer ratio is 0.8 to 1. The school is connected to the Internet through fiber-optic connection and every classroom has access to WI-FI. Students utilize devices to access the Internet for student learning. 2018-2019 Safety and Behavior Data 28.1% of students have behavior events. Discipline resolutions include 15.2% out of school suspensions and 21.2% in-school removals. White (non-Hispanic) students make up the largest group of behavior events. Males outnumber females by 2:1 in total behavior events. 6th grade has the largest number of total behavior events. The classroom is the location with the largest percentage of behavior events. Current State: What Does the Data Not Tell Us?

Assessment Culture The data does not show the assessment culture of the school. Student stamina is greatly impacted by time, endurance, and motivation. The school staff have implemented an Assessment Ready culture for the current school year. School staff, as a portion of the school turnaround plan, have also implemented a new assessment protocol. Through this process, students have the opportunity to visualize what proficient and distinguished work looks like. Students are also being timed more often on formative and summative assessments to assist with gaining a better understanding of time constraints. Scoring Ranges The data shows students remaining in the apprentice range. The students have some knowledge at the skill level, but do not perform at the proficient depth of knowledge level. The data does not provide individual standard or cluster data for instructional purposes. Classroom based essential standard data shows greater student proficiency in the area of mathematics, Student work samples show students using multiple models for solution and solving problems. These multiple models, while fluent and chosen by the student, do not fit within the time constraints assigned for state assessment.

Valid Curriculum Teaching staff meet twice weekly in professional learning communities to design instruction at a higher level of rigor matched to the standard and are working on scaffolding instruction for all students. The PLC process utilizing a PDSA quality tool was implemented during the 18/19 school year, but has not had one full year of implementation for data. Writing The data does not show the difficulties the students experience with the writing process. Classroom observation shows students with difficulty in letter formation and a lack of understanding of the components of simple sentence construction. Classroom based assessment data and student work samples show student difficulty with the communication of a message for an intended audience. Behavior The data does not show the classroom based teacher implemented interventions provided to students. During the 19/20 school year the school administration along with staff have begun implementation of PBIS through ongoing professional development and coaching. Staff have identified and implemented schoolwide procedures and routines. Hallway, stairway, cafeteria, and other common areas have had a common language and expectations assigned, taught, reviewed, and retaught through the first three months of school. Teachers utilize team level interventions, parent contact, behavior contracts, and Tier I, II, and III interventions. Students also have access to a behavior intervention teacher and area for immediate Tier II and III individualized interventions. Administration has created a student team to focus on emotional and mental health of students to ensure that all students needing access to mental health have this opportunity. A large population of students continue to need Tier II and III behavior intervention and instruction for access to the learning environment.

Leadership The data does not show that during the 2018/2019 school year there was a change in leadership during the month of February with the school Assistant Principal being the constant. This change has been repeated over time. During the current year all leadership has returned with the change on a school counselor.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



[AdvancED Engagement Review Report January 2019](#)



[KASC Graph Spring 2019](#)

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

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.

Priorities/Concerns: Primary Areas of Concern: 30% of all students are performing at the proficient and distinguished level in reading. 44.4% of all students are performing at the novice level in reading. 45.9% of students showed no growth in the area of reading as measured through growth data. 23.6% of all students are performing at the proficient and distinguished levels in mathematics. 36.8% of all students are performing at the novice level in mathematics. 42.55% of students showed no growth in the area of mathematics as measured through growth data. 5.2% of all students are performing at the proficient and distinguished levels in science. 46.6% of all students are performing at the novice level in science. 48.3% of students remain in the apprentice performance level. 23.5% of all students are performing at the proficient and distinguished levels in social studies. 35.3% of all students are performing at the novice levels in social studies.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

 KCWP 1

 KCWP 2

 KCWP 3

 KCWP 4

 KCWP 5

 KCWP 6

Trends

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

Trends: Analyzing data trends from the past three academic years and the past two universal screening points reading, writing, math, science, and social studies remain significant areas for improvement. Reading performance levels have shown minimal change across six academic years (2013/2014 to 2018/2019). Over the past six academic years the percent of students at the proficient and distinguished levels in reading has not exceeded 36%. These trends hold true across groups of students with no group performing statistically higher than another group. Reading Growth data from the most recent state assessment performance reveals that 23.71% of students maintained the same performance level. 18.84% of students grew to the next performance level. 6.69% of students grew two performance levels. 4.26% of students grew three performance levels. 0.30% of students grew four performance levels. Mathematics performance levels have shown minimal change across six academic years. The academic data from state assessment reporting show proficient and distinguished levels in mathematics have not exceeded 35%. Most recent assessment data is the lowest in the six year data review. Mathematics Growth data from the most recent state assessment performance reveals that 31% of students maintained the same performance level. 17.33 % of students grew to the next performance level. 7.60% of students grew two performance levels. 1.52% of students grew three performance levels. Science performance for two consecutive years reveals the percent of students at the proficient and distinguished levels to not have exceeded 15.2%. Most recent data shows declines of 10%. Writing performance, as determined by the percent proficient and distinguished has also declined across the past six academic years. This data reveals that students have not exceeded 23.1% during this time period. The 2018/2019 data for writing is the lowest of the last six years.

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](#)

Potential Source of Problem: The information below was presented through the Advance Ed Diagnostic Review to the Newport Intermediate School Administrative Team. The Diagnostic Review Team conducted 21 classroom observations. Well-Managed Learning Environment earned the highest overall average rating of 2.6 on a four-point scale. The data shows that students were engaged in well-managed and supportive learning environments, the Diagnostic Review Team identified a need for school leaders to carefully monitor instructional practices and student learning tasks to ensure that academic growth occurs. Several relative strengths emerged related to interactions between and among students and their teachers. Three relative strengths were identified in the Well-Managed Learning Environment. It was evident/very evident in 62 percent of classrooms that students spoke and interacted “respectfully with teacher(s) and each other” (F1), in 52 percent of classrooms that students “follow classroom rules and behavioral expectations and work well with others” (F2), and in 52 percent of classrooms that learners “transition smoothly and efficiently from one activity to another” (F3). Other relative strengths were identified. In the Equitable Learning Environment, for example, learners who were “treated in a fair, clear, and consistent manner” (A3) were evident/very evident in 67 percent of classrooms. In the Supportive Learning Environment, learners who were “supported by the teacher, their peers, and/or other resources to understand content and accomplish tasks” (C3) were evident/very evident in 67 percent of classrooms. Although the Digital Learning Environment had the lowest rating, the team expressed greater concern about items in the Equitable, High Expectations, and Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environments related to opportunities for students to be engaged in effective instructional practices. It was evident/very evident that students demonstrated and/or described “high quality work” (B3) in 10 percent of classrooms. In addition, it was evident/very evident in 34 percent of classrooms that students were engaged “in rigorous coursework, discussions, and/or tasks that require the use of higher order thinking (e.g., analyzing, applying, evaluating, synthesizing)” (B4). The Diagnostic Review Team also identified items in the Progress Monitoring and Feedback Learning Environment as leverage points to improve instruction. It was evident/very evident that students monitored “their own learning progress” or had “mechanisms whereby their learning progress” was monitored (E1) in 24 percent of classrooms and that students understood and/or were “able to explain how their work is assessed” (E4) in 19 percent of classrooms. Most students did not know whether they were making progress or how they were being assessed. Finally, the greatest leverage area for maximizing student achievement emerged in the Equitable Learning Environment. It was evident/very evident in 15 percent of classrooms that students “engaged in differentiated learning opportunities and/or activities that meet their needs” (A1). It was evident/very evident in 10 percent of classrooms that students “demonstrate and/or have opportunities to develop empathy/respect/appreciation for differences in abilities, aptitudes, backgrounds, cultures, and/or other human characteristics, conditions and dispositions” (A4). The Diagnostic Review Team suggests school leaders and staff members engage in careful examination of all items within the seven learning environments to identify

additional levers to improve instructional capacity and increase student learning. The Improvement Priorities outlined in this report will serve as a guide for the school in prioritizing areas of focus.

Improvement Priority #1 Create and use a system to monitor the implementation of all instructional practices and programs for quality and fidelity. Analyze data and use findings to adjust instructional practices and evaluate practices and programs for impact and effectiveness. (Standard 2.11)

Problem of Practice 1: School lacks in-depth understanding of the intent of all standards; thus instruction and assessments are not congruent.

Problem of Practice 2: School does not currently have a balanced assessment system (formatives, interim, summatives) in place that informs instructional adjustments and curricular changes.

Problem of Practice 3: Students are not cognitively engaged as a result of ineffective strategy/activity selection that are congruent to the intent of the standard. The stakeholder interview data revealed that Newport Intermediate School lacked a clear focus. Data collected from school and district leaders suggested that Newport Intermediate was in the initial stage of implementing many instructional practices and programs to improve student learning. Most teachers and support staff reported that these programs and initiatives had been introduced within a short period of time. While school leaders and staff members noted that the programs and initiatives were beneficial to the improvement of teaching and learning, the interview data also showed that staff members had minimal input into their selection or the timeframe for implementation. The data showed initiatives were rarely implemented with fidelity and consistency over time. Longitudinal data did not exist for most initiatives, since instructional practices and requirements from district leadership changed frequently. The interview data revealed minimal common understanding of a continuous improvement cycle or systematic program evaluation. Evidence indicated that while some data were collected on programs and initiatives, this information was not effectively communicated to all stakeholders. Interview data revealed few meaningful, collaborative discussions to plan and execute mid-course corrections. Teachers reported that common assessment strategies were being implemented, but little evidence existed to show assessments were aligned to standards or contained the rigor and depth of knowledge required for students to reach Proficient or Distinguished on the K-PREP assessment. The interview data showed that parents perceived a lack of instructional rigor and expressed concern that their children may not be prepared to be successful at the next level.

Improvement Priority #2 Identify, coordinate, and implement all available services and resources including support staff, volunteers, and community partners for maximum impact on students' social, emotional, developmental, and academic needs. Evaluate the effectiveness of these services and resources to ensure they are meeting the specialized needs of students. (Standard 2.9)

The stakeholder interview data showed the lack of a formal, systematic process for identifying or progress monitoring student learning to determine needed interventions. The interview data revealed that the school had written criteria for entering and exiting intervention tiers. Also, the interview data indicated that community partners and parents perceived that while mentoring programs were valuable, few mentors were available. While some students received support in the behavior intervention room, interview data showed many stakeholders reported inconsistencies in how students were placed in this intervention. In addition, small-group counseling sessions existed, but many staff members were unaware of how students were identified for these services. Few staff members could describe a continuous improvement process as it applied to academic and behavioral interventions for students. The interview data showed that while student behavior data were routinely collected, information was typically communicated to teachers through email rather than through a systematic process that involved collaborative discussions and an analysis of data to guide adjustments for addressing individual student needs. Interview data showed that the Student Intervention Team rarely met with teachers to collaborate on the impact of the intervention program.

Design and Deploy Standards is an area of greatest impact for school turnaround efforts. The strategic and classroom level Key Core Work Processes support initial Review data. Newport Intermediate, with strategic level support, immediately implemented protocol for guiding the work of professional learning communities. Teachers plan

collaboratively to determine what we want our students to learn and do. Educators work with an instructional coach to deconstruct the learning through a task analysis. This work ensures the level of rigor and congruency of the targets. The work outlined within design and deploy standards has been a priority focus and continues to be an area of concern and leverage with great impact. All key elements of the process are in progress. (Priority 1) Design and Deliver Instruction is an area of greatest impact for school turnaround efforts. The strategic and classroom level Key Core Work Processes support initial Review data. Newport Intermediate, with strategic level support, immediately implemented process and protocol for ensuring systems are implemented at the school level for Tier I, II, and III instruction. A focus of the school has been on the fidelity of programs based on implementation and student progress. The work outlined within design and deliver instruction has been a priority focus and continues to be an area of concern and leverage with great impact. Educators examine how students will learn the rigorous standards. They collaboratively plan for high quality core instruction utilizing the class structure non-negotiables to include cognitive engagement, frequency checks for understanding, and embedded Tiered instruction. Working with an instructional coach the teams of teachers identify the high yield/impact instructional strategies that students and educators will use. An important focus has been on high levels of support, scaffolds, and cognitive engagement throughout the phases of learning given such a high range of students at the novice levels. One element of the Key Core Work Processes not yet fully implemented is a system to ensure students take responsibility for their own learning. (Priority 1) As Newport Intermediate continues progressing through the turnaround work, Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy paired with Review, Analyze, Apply Data Results are areas of impact for school turnaround efforts that has been utilized for the greatest leverage. The strategic and classroom level Key Core Work Processes support initial Review data. Teachers utilize the PDSA quality tool to guide the study and act phase of this practice. Teachers work collaboratively to create common daily formative assessments, chunked assessments, and summative assessments. Each teacher completes all classroom level data analysis needed for the study and act phases for discussion at PLC teaming. Educators address the data questions outlined with the NIS Assessment Protocol and develop next steps for improved learning and teaching. Through this Key Core work Process teachers also address what is done when students did not master the Tier I instructional targets. Collaborative redesigns occur for those students drilling down to the specific skill deficit or conceptual issue. This data then moves back to study and act within the PLC teams. Teacher feedback for next step growth shows an immediate need for: systems for students to track and evaluate their progress and set goals, systems for grading and communication of student learning, and assessment resources for individual content area and grade level use. Teachers also note an immediate need for data tracking tools given the data rich environment of the school. Leadership perception data analysis identifies the need for a system to bring all of the data to one place so that information to improve instruction and reduce the number of students scoring novice will occur. (Priority 1) As outlined in the Newport Intermediate School turnaround plan, Design, Align, and Deliver Support Processes is also a focus from our identified Priority 2. . The school has created a system and team to ensure that behavioral and mental health interventions are taking place and are showing expected progress for the identified need. All students are tracked for appropriate academic interventions with the goal of having all students identified within the third tier receiving in school, after school, or day time waiver support and intervention. As stated previously, the school utilizes the PDSA quality tool to ensure that students in need of support receive immediate intervention or redesign of instruction. The school leadership team monitors the effectiveness of programs through first looking at evidence based practices from the lens of our student population and need. (Priority 2)









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%.

Strengths/Leverages
3rd Grade Reading performance reveals proficient and distinguished increased by 4.4%
5th Grade Math performance shows proficient and distinguished increased by 3.3%
5th Grade Social Studies performance shows proficient and distinguished increased by 2.6%
3rd Grade Reading performance reveals novice percentages decreased 8.8%.
5th Grade Social Studies novice percentages decreased 4.2%

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 AdvancED Engagement Review Report January 2019	AdvancED Engagement Review Report January 2019	•
 KASC Graph Spring 2019	Attached is the KASC graph of our Spring 2019 Data	•
 KCWP 1		•
 KCWP 2		•
 KCWP 3		•
 KCWP 4		•
 KCWP 5		•
 KCWP 6		•