Needs Assessment & Budget Considerations

School: Dayton Creek Elementary School

Building Number: 0957

State Assessment Review

1. Provide a brief overview of your data. (Comparison to state average, areas of strength, areas of concern)

Math: Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level, by Grade						
SY: 2023-2024		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total % of Levels 3 & 4
3rd Grade	**DCES**	**5**	**12**	**49**	**34**	**83**
	USD 230	*14*	*25*	*38*	*24*	*62*
	State	*22*	*26*	*31*	*20*	*51*
4th Grade	**DCES**	**1**	**24**	**44**	**29**	**73**
	USD 230	*9*	*37*	*36*	*18*	*54*
	State	*19*	*43*	*26*	*12*	*38*
5th Grade	**DCES**	**21**	**42**	**23**	**15**	**38**
	USD 230	*25*	*33*	*22*	*20*	*42*
	State	*33*	*33*	*20*	*13*	*33*

Math: Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level, by Grade, by Year						
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total % of Levels 3 & 4
3rd Grade	*2021-2022*	0	20	49	32	**81**
	2022-2023	0	22	30	49	**79**
	2023-2024	5	12	49	34	**83**
4th Grade	*2021-2022*	3	30	55	12	**67**
	2022-2023	2	33	49	16	**65**
	2023-2024	1	24	44	29	**73**
5th Grade	*2021-2022*	27	36	18	18	**36**
	2022-2023	11	31	26	31	**57**
	2023-2024	21	42	23	15	**38**

Strengths in Math Outcomes:

- The percentage of students at Levels 3 and 4 increased for 3rd and 4th Grade
- 90% of our students from 3-5th Grade are in Levels 2-4
- Only 10% of our students from 3-5th Grade are in Level 1
- The percentage of students at Level 3 and 4 in 3rd Grade is 21% more than district average
- 3rd and 4th Grade Scores meet state standards in all categories of assessed math skills and concepts
- 84% of 3rd Graders either met or exceeded Level 3 in Operations and Algebraic thinking.
- In 4th Grade, 76% of students either met or exceeded Level 3 in Numbers and Operations with Fractions
- All tested grade Levels 3-5 show proficiency in Strategic Thinking and Reasoning

Areas of Concerns in Math Outcomes:

- Decreased percentage of students at Levels 3 and 4 in 5th Grade. (Specific skills and concepts: Numbers and Operations in Base 10 and Fractions, Measurement & Data)

ELA: Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level, by Grade						
SY: 2023-2024		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total % of Levels 3 & 4
3rd Grade	**DCES**	**21**	**21**	**38**	**19**	**57**
	USD 230	*27*	*29*	*29*	*15*	*44*
	State	*30*	*30*	*26*	*14*	*40*
4th Grade	**DCES**	**7**	**33**	**56**	**4**	**60**
	USD 230	*12*	*33*	*40*	*14*	*54*
	State	*18*	*38*	*34*	*11*	*45*
5th Grade	**DCES**	**15**	**35**	**31**	**19**	**50**
	USD 230	*21*	*26*	*33*	*19*	*52*
	State	*31*	*29*	*26*	*14*	*40*

Reading: Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level, by Grade, by Year						
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total % of Levels 3 & 4
3rd Grade	*2021-2022*	*7*	*32*	*37*	*24*	**61**
	2022-2023	*11*	*38*	*30*	*22*	**52**
	2023-2024	*21*	*21*	*38*	*19*	**57**
4th Grade	*2021-2022*	*3*	*45*	*42*	*9*	**51**
	2022-2023	*4*	*42*	*42*	*11*	**53**
	2023-2024	*7*	*33*	*56*	*4*	**60**
5th Grade	*2021-2022*	*14*	*23*	*50*	*14*	**64**
	2022-2023	*14*	*23*	*43*	*20*	**63**
	2023-2024	*15*	*35*	*31*	*19*	**50**

Strengths in ELA Outcomes:

- 86.6% of our students from 3-5th Grade are in Levels 2-4
- Only 13.4% of our students from 3-5th Grade are in Level 1
- The percentage of students at Level 3 and 4 in 3rd and 4th Grader is more than district average
- Looking at the cohort data, the % of proficiency from 3rd grade last year to 4th Grade now increased by 8%
- All tested grade Levels 3-5 show proficiency in Overall Writing

Areas of Concerns in ELA Outcomes:

- 3rd-5th Grade: Key Ideas & Details
- 4th Grade: Text Types and Purposes
- 5th Grade: Craft, Structure, & Language in Reading, Language in Writing

ELA KAP DATA						
	1	2	3	4	1/2	3/4
2024	14%	30%	42%	14%	44%	56%
2023	10%	34%	38%	18%	44%	56%
2022	8%	33%	37%	16%	41%	53%
AVERAGE	**11%**	**32%**	**39%**	**16%**	**43%**	**55%**

MATH KAP DATA						
	1	2	3	4	1/2	3/4
2024	9%	26%	39%	26%	35%	65%
2023	4%	29%	35%	32%	33%	67%
2022	10%	29%	41%	20%	39%	61%
AVERAGE	**8%**	**28%**	**38%**	**26%**	**36%**	**64%**

SCIENCE KAP DATA						
	1	2	3	4	1/2	3/4
2024	17%	31%	25%	27%	48%	52%
2023	9%	23%	40%	29%	32%	69%
2022	9%	27%	41%	23%	36%	64%
AVERAGE	**12%**	**27%**	**35%**	**26%**	**39%**	**62%**

Note on 3th-5th Grade Population for each SY:
SY 21-22: 99 students, SY 22-23: 121 students, SY 23-24: 141 students

Overall Strengths:

- The % of students at Level 3 and 4 went for 3rd Grade (ELA up by 5%, Math up by 4%) and 4th Grade (ELA up by 7% and Math up by 8%)
- In ELA, we have about 86% of our students performing at Levels 2-4.
- Considering that there was an increase of student population as well as a new curriculum, we were still able to maintain % of Levels 3 and 4 for ELA
- In Math, 91% of our students are performing at Levels 2-4.

Areas of Concern:

- ELA percentage of students at Levels 3 & 4 in all tested grade levels is below 60%
- 17% decline in the percentage of students at Levels 3 & 4 for Science (tested in 5th Grade only)

2. What steps are you taking for all students to maximize their scores? Note any areas that your staff have been working to improve.

- Multi-Tiered System of Support
  - Fidelity in using the FastBridge Screener
  - Having a strong multi-level prevention system starting from the Tier 1 Implementation of CKLA & iReady to the data informed W.I.N. (What I Need Time) time for differentiated instruction
  - Timely progress monitoring especially for both Tier 2 and Tier 3
- Establishing structures that promote collaboration in PLC (PLC Agenda, Norms) and CAPS Meetings
- Purposeful and Relevant Professional Development (i.e. LETRS, CKLA, iReady, Behavior Analysis) and providing staff opportunities to apply and practice it in the classroom
- Empowering our families to be involved in supporting student outcomes by giving them information around the curriculum and assessment as well as tools to help them at home
- Strengthening Leader in Me implementation to empower students to be leaders f
- Academic Goal Setting through Leader in Me (2024-2025)

Building Needs Assessment & Budget Considerations

3. What barriers must be overcome for each student to achieve grade level proficiency?

A. **Shortage of Staff for Instructional Support** (ELL teachers, SPED and Intervention Paraprofessionals)
  - The limited number of staff members providing instructional support does not correlate with the increasing number of students needing more individualized and intensive support coupled with increasing class sizes.
  - This barrier significantly limits our capacity to fully implement effective and efficient MTSS (e.g. size of intervention groups are larger, ratio of paras to students needing varying levels of support in the classroom to access general education)
  - This can also contribute to burnout for existing staff
  - It's also important to note that our pool of applicants for instructional support positions is also small.

B. **Instructional Time Constraints:**
  - We have limited time to provide targeted intervention in reading and math. Students who are needing direct services for SPED are limited to providing services during WIN time (30 minutes in reading and 30 minutes for math.)
  - Students who are pulled during WIN time for intensive Tier 3 support based on FastBridge screener have limited to no opportunity for additional Tier 2 support beyond what the teacher is providing during Tier 1/core time. This then limits opportunity to improve in grade level outcomes.
  - Because ELA and Math are taking most of the instructional minutes, Science instructional minutes are impacted.
  - Science standards can be integrated in STEM, but STEM is only on a part-time/ alternating schedule with Art. STEM provides great opportunities for rigorous and relevant instruction that could help our students acquire and practice not just scientific and math skills but 21st century learning skills.

C. **Professional Development Needs**
  - Increasing need to support teachers in strengthening Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction and assessment design (training and resources). More PD time is needed to train teachers and give them opportunities to plan and design resources to support Tier 2 instruction that also aligns with the rigor in KAP.
  - Confusion around our existing grading system and the use of assessments in our resources.
  - Limited paraprofessional training on content and strategies to enhance their abilities to meet the

diverse needs of students particularly during in class support as well as small group instruction

4. What budget actions should be taken to address and remove those barriers?

- **To address Barrier A:** Hire additional instructional support
  - For DCES:
    - 1 more SPED Para, our budget is currently allotted for 5 but we only have 3 existing paras.
    - 2 more intervention paras (1 for reading and 1 for math)
  - For USD 230:
    - To address the limited pool of applicants, we may need to consider increasing the hourly rate of our paras to make the position more competitive/inviting for applicants as well as retain our hardworking paras.
    - Hire 1 additional ELL teacher so we can improve our support for ELLs. It is imperative that we protect this subgroup from unnecessary identification for specialized services. It is our duty to provide the language support they need to access our Tier 1 instruction. Having an additional ELL teacher will also provide an opportunity for collaboration with classroom teachers. Teachers learning about effective strategies for ELLs will benefit not just our ELL population but all students.
- **To address Barrier B:**
  - Hire additional instructional support for DCES (1 more sped para, 2 more intervention paras)
  - Budget for STEM as a full time specials class to support Science instruction and align with state standards
- **To address Barrier C:**
  - Budget for additional trainings around CKLA and iREady
  - Allocate resources for Tier 2 support
    - IXL Reading or CKLA Boost Reading
    - purchase more licenses for My Path for math support
  - Survey paraprofessionals about their training needs and allocate resources for their training
  - Allocate resources to review and improve the existing grading system. We need to further analyze what assessments are in the grade card and its relationship to KAP outcomes.
  - Provide more training opportunities for our SPED and Interventionists
  - If building PD time is limited due to other factors we are unable to control, (i.e. district calendar, required instructional minutes) we should consider increasing incentive for teachers to participate in the Summer Summit or provide financial support for Guiding Coalition or Building Leadership Teams to engage in conferences (e.g. ASCD, Model Schools, ISTE, NCTM, Solution Tree)
  - We should consider allocating resources for PD opportunities for our Specials teachers so we can leverage on their roles to support student outcomes

5. What amount of time do you estimate that it will take for each student to achieve grade level proficiency (level 3 or higher) on the state assessments if the budget actions would be implemented.

- With the implementation of these budget actions, it is reasonable to expect a noticeable improvement in student proficiency within 1-2 academic years, with sustained and incremental progress over 2-3 years. In alignment with our school improvement plan, these budgetary actions will allow us to meet at least 90% proficiency rate by 2028.
- The combined efforts of additional support staff, targeted interventions, professional development, and resource allocation will create a more robust support system conducive to achieving grade-level proficiency for ELA, Math, and Science.


USD 230
SPRING HILL
SCHOOLS