

## **NIS 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools**

2020-21 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: 10/21/2020

Status: Locked

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools .....	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment .....	4
Protocol .....	5
Current State .....	6
Priorities/Concerns .....	13
Trends .....	14
Potential Source of Problem.....	15
Strengths/Leverages .....	18
Attachment Summary .....	19

## 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

### 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?

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, two Counselors, and Instructional Coach. All certified teachers met as a staff in the month of October on two separate occasions (October 6 & 20) to analyze 2019 state assessment data by school, grade level, sub group, classroom, and individual student and 2020 Winter and Fall MAP Data. All certified teachers met in Professional Learning Communities twice 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 at their September meeting (September 23). All parents received initial notification of student data in October of 2019. Fall MAP Scores were communicated with families in October of 2020 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, 2020 Winter NWEA MAP, 2020 Fall NWEA MAP, Attendance data, Economic Data, Demographic Makeup, Safety Data, Advance Ed Diagnostic Winter 2018, Title Intervention Program Data, Improvement Priority Deconstruction

## 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 we will be reporting on the 2019 KPREP Scores. NIS and all KY Schools did not take the 2020 KPREP Test. Newport Intermediate School received a 44.5 indicator score in the area of proficiency, 33.4 indicator score in separate academic indicator, and a 49.5 indicator score in the area of growth. 2018/2019 data 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 Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 50.4 23.7 25.9 2018 59.7 24.8 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). NWEA MAP Winter 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 29% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 23% 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. 15% 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. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 13% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 9% 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. 18% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 36% of students

performed in the hi range which is above the 80th 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 Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 46.6 30.5 22.9 2018 30.6 40.5 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. NWEA MAP Winter 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 30% of student are performing below the 21st percentile. 23% 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. 19% 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. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 20% of student are performing below the 21st percentile. 13% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 21% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 10% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 36% 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 Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 47.4 31 21.5 2018 37.2 29.5 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. NWEA MAP Winter 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 45% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 25% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 11% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 17% 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. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 16% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 32% 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. 10% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 19% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. 4th Grade Math2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis:2019Novice 42.2Apprentice 38.8Proficiency & Distinguished 18.92018Novice 27.9Apprentice 34.9Proficient & Distinguished 37.2YearNoviceApprenticeProficient & Distinguished201942.238.818.9201827.934.937.2Novice 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. NWEA MAP Winter 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 47% 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. 12% 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. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 22% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 29% 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. 20% 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. 4th Grade Science2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: 2019Novice 46.6Apprentice 48.3Proficiency & Distinguished 5.22018Novice 36.8Apprentice 48Proficient & Distinguished 15.2YearNoviceApprenticeProficient & Distinguished201946.648.35.2201836.84815.2Novice percentages increased by 9.8%Apprentice percentages increased by .3%Proficient and Distinguished decreased by 10%5th Grade Reading2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis:2019Novice 35.3Apprentice 26.1Proficiency & Distinguished 38.62018Novice 32.8Apprentice 26.9Proficient & Distinguished 40.3YearNoviceApprenticeProficient & Distinguished201935.326.138.6201832.826.940.3Novice 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. NWEA MAP Winter 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 33% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 33% 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. 14% 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. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 49% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 19% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 8% 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. 8% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. 5th Grade Math 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 33.638.727.720 1832.842.924.4 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. NWEA MAP Winter 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 34% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 24% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 21% 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. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 45% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 15% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 30% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 5% 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. 5th Grade Social Studies 2018 to 2019 - Spring KPREP data analysis: Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 35.341.223.520 1839.540.320.1 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 Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 56.334.59.220 1840 4713.1 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: Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 43.921.534.62018 38.825.935.3 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. NWEA MAP Winter 20 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. 25% 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. 8% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 36% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 31% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 20% 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. 4% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile. 6th Grade Math 2018 to 2019 Spring KPREP data analysis: Year Novice Apprentice Proficient & Distinguished 2019 22.452.325.32018 15.55034.4 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. NWEA MAP Winter 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 35% of students performing below the 21st percentile. 14% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 31% 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. NWEA MAP Fall 20 data, utilized for universal screening, shows that 34% of students performing below

the 21st percentile. 28% of students performed within the low average range between the 21st and 40th percentile. 34% of students performed in the average range between the 41st and 60th percentile. 4% of students performed in the high average range between the 61st and 80th percentile. 0% of students performed in the hi range which is above the 80th percentile.

2019-2020 Title I and Other Grant Data Title 1 Funded program, Read 180/System 44 data reveals 59 students served in the program during the 19/20 school year. The assessment data that was used is Winter MAP 2019. Winter (2019/2020) Map Data: Novice 49/59= 83% Apprentice. 7/59= 12% Proficient and Distinguished 3/59= 5% The SRI assessment is utilized to monitor growth within the program. This data reveals 5 students in the normal range growth (75-100pts in a year), 15 above range growth ( over 100pts in a year), and 39 below range growth ( 0- 75 points gained). 14 of the 39 students below did not get to complete their second SRI assessment since they began the program mid year and due to NTI in the Spring, were unable to complete the second assessment. Therefore, the data shows no growth for those 14 students. Program analysis shows many students made gains in their lexile reading score, even though they were still not apprentice or proficient on NWEA MAP assessment. 3 students exited the program during the year because they were proficient on Winter MAP assessment. Title and Grant funded Read to Achieve program revealed the following results: On winter MAP 2019 scores, four students were near apprentice level, while two scored apprentice and one student scored proficient. The students gained an average of nine points on the NWEA map test when comparing the scores from Fall to Winter. Students grew an average of 2.7 F and P levels from Fall to Winter. (Three F and P levels are generally one year's growth.) Also, 52% of the students served by RTA were reading instructionally third grade material by January 2020, according to their F and P scores.

Non-Academic Current State 2019-2020 Student Demographic Data Newport Intermediate School serves students in grades 3 through 6 with a total population of 447 students. The school is a Title I eligible/ schoolwide school with 93.3% of students found to be economically disadvantaged representing 417 students as compared to 30 students found to be not economically disadvantaged. 49.6% of the student population is White (non-Hispanic), 19% African American, 15.7% Hispanic or Latino, and 15.7% other. 8.5% of students are English Language Learners. 14% of the total population are students with disabilities with an IEP. 3.1% of students are identified as Gifted and Talented learners. 2019/2020 4th grade represented the largest grade of students at Newport Intermediate with 119 students. 2019-2020 Attendance Data 7.41% of students at Newport Intermediate were rated as chronically absent. Homeless students received 27.03% chronically absent ratings. The overall attendance rate for 2019/2020 was 95.72%. 2019-2020 Learning Environment Data The student to teacher ratio is 11:1. 45.2% of teachers have a Bachelor's degree, 41.9% have earned a Master's degree, and 12.9% have earned a Rank 1. The average years of school experience is 6.4. Teacher turnover is at 50%. According to the teacher working conditions, School Climate is 42% favorable, Managing Student Behavior is 32% favorable, School Leadership is 52% favorable. 2019-2020 Technology Data The student has 522 Devices within the school. 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. 2019-2020 Safety and Behavior Data 33.6% of students have behavior events. Discipline resolutions include 25.4% out of school suspensions and 72.5% in-school removals. African American students make up the largest group of behavior events. Males outnumber females by 2:1 in total behavior events. 4th 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 now 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. The revised PLC process utilizes the backward design process to focus on the deployment of deconstructed standards to create appropriate summative assessments that are aligned with the intent of the standard, rigor, time constraints, and formatting of the KPrep Assessment. Summative assessments are created in a collaborative environment to vet the assessment measure for congruency. Upon assessment administration results will be analyzed for student mastery, intervention opportunities, and possible reteaching. Scoring RangesThe 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 CurriculumTeaching staff meet twice weekly in professional learning communities to design rigorous instruction congruent to the intent of the standard and scaffold instruction to ensure success for all students. The PLC process utilizes a 4-step tool that was implemented during the 20/21 school year. This process utilizes the backward design. During Step 1, PLC teams identify standards, deconstruct standards, and identify key vocabulary. At Step 2, PLC teams build summative assessments matching KPREP Formatting, Time, Structure, Rigor, Relevance, etc. At this step, PLC Teams provide honest and courageous collegial feedback to revise and improve quality of assessments. Step 3 concentrates on PLC teams carefully designing daily instruction around the summative assessments. PLC Teams will be working on resources, activities, strategies, clear learning targets, materials, and daily formative assessments. Step 4 involves data analysis of the summative assessment to guide the next steps of instruction. Teams determine the next instructional steps based on collective unit data and collegial conversations. Our PLC process guides staff in the step-by-step development of a valid curriculum and provides an opportunity for strong stakeholder involvement and teacher professional growth. WritingThe data does not show the difficulties the students experience with the writing process. Classroom observations show students have a lack of understanding of idea development, organization, sentence fluency, conventions, word choice, and voice. Lesson plans indicated a lack of intentional writing planning. The revised PLC process created specific expectations of the writing program such as developing writing units and teaching the six traits of writing. Classroom based assessment data and student work samples show student difficulty with the communication of a message for a

## **ATTACHMENTS**

### **Attachment Name**

---



[Needs Assessment 2020-2021](#)



## 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.

Primary Areas of Concern: KPREP 2019 Concerns: 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. MAP Fall 2020 Concerns: 3rd Grade: 20 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in MATH. 21 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in ELA. 4th Grade: 6 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in MATH. 22 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in ELA. 5th Grade: 6 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in MATH. 17 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in ELA. 6th Grade: 2 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in MATH. 8 Students are predicted to be Proficient or Distinguished on the 2021 K-PREP in ELA. Covid-19 Slide: Students were not physically in the buildings from March 2020-September 29th, 2020.

## Trends

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

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). There was no testing in 2020. The most recent data (KPREP 2019) was used to determine these trends. 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 time frame 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 a 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 have 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%.

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)
 <a href="#">Needs Assessment 2020-2021</a>	PDF of Needs Assessment (Easier to read)	•