## Module 2: Part 1 - Needs Assessment (School Report Card)

The Identifying Needs Protocol to follow is designed to support Comprehensive School Improvement Teams (CSIT) at each school identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) understand the current conditions of teaching and learning. This protocol is meant to be used after reading all of Module 2 and should be facilitated by a trained LEA or RIDE staff member.

This protocol is the first step in a three-step process which will ultimately result in the CSIT identifying $3-5$ high-priority needs and their likely root causes.

This first protocol is intended to support the CSIT to identify a broad variety of needs across many points of data. CSIT members will likely jump directly to prioritizing needs and making inferences. At this stage, it is important to resist the temptation to prioritize and merely ask clarifying questions about the data, describe and take note of what they see, and develop a common understanding of the baseline conditions for outcomes at the CSI school. Facilitators should help keep participants focused on the low-inference nature of this first step of understanding the data by reminding them that later stages of the needs assessment and root cause analysis process will dig more deeply into what more far-reaching implications of the data may be.

This data protocol specifically focuses on the Rhode Island School Report Cards which look at many indicators across a wide-range of outcome data at the school level, including demographic information, climate and culture data like attendance and suspensions, as well as academic achievement data like proficiency and growth on various subject-specific assessments. Other valuable sources of data, such as SurveyWorks, or additional locally produced data, (i.e. programmatic quality data or instructional rounds) will be brought into consideration to inform the root-cause analysis portion of Module 2.

The reason for only using report card data at this stage is to focus the CSITs understanding of current performance on those valid, reliable, and statewide measures for which all schools are held accountable. These also include the data that determines the school's identification as in need of CSI, and so it supports CSITs in identifying needs that, when properly addressed, will result in improvement within the statewide system of accountability.

This data protocol can be used by any Rhode Island school regardless of their rating on the statewide system of accountability in order to support improvement efforts. This protocol requires facilitation by a person who is well-versed in the metrics and methods of the RI Statewide System of Accountability and its school report cards. If you need additional support with this facilitation, please reach out to the Office of School \& District Improvement via email: osdi@ride.ri.gov

## Facilitator Directions

## Participants

This protocol is meant to be performed with a CSI schools CSIT, please ensure the members of your team meet the requirements of the Education Accountability Act (quick reference).

## Time

The protocol will take 90-120 minutes, depending on participants' familiarity with school report card data.

## Before facilitation:

You'll want a space that can comfortably fit your entire CSIT plus facilitators (up to 18 people). You'll need an active connection to the internet (you will be navigating through https://reportcard.ride.ri.gov) and a large screen visible to the entire room. Make sure you have a space where the entire group can engage in conversation and hear one another without background noise.

Make sure all participants are informed ahead of time of the objective for this protocol:
To collectively understand the objective performance of the CSI school across a broad variety of data included in the school report card and to identify and record a wide range of needs.

Participants should only record objective statements of fact, without assumptions or evaluation. Participants should not "climb the ladder of inference" at this stage.

## During the facilitation:

1. Make sure every member of the CSIT has a Module 2 Appendix i - Identifying Needs note-taking sheet.
2. Navigate to https://reportcard.ride.ri.gov and find your district and school in the dropdown menu as shown below:

3. You'll arrive at your school's overview page. At the top you'll see your school contact information and star rating. Below that on the left, you'll see text about the school. Note that the text on this page is submitted by the LEA to RIDE. On the right you'll see high-level demographic information. When you hover over the "Number of Students" and "Number of Educators" you'll see demographic breakdowns.

4. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the data. Ask participants to record their responses to Question 1: "What do you notice about the school's demographic data for teachers and students?"
5. Now click on the "Accountability" Tab to the right over the "Overview Tab." On the Accountability Overview, you'll notice a new nested set of tabs open up. These each correspond to a data point in the accountability system. We will be looking at all of them over the course of this protocol. The main feature of this page is the Star Chart, which tells you how a school receives its overall star rating. Below the Star Chart, you'll also see a list of subgroups identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) along with the particular areas of performance for which these subgroups are identified as requiring support.

6. Let participants know they will be revisiting this table and these questions at the end of the protocol. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the accountability system, star ratings, and ATSI/TSI identification. Then ask the participants to record their responses to Question 2: "Overall, what high and low spots do you notice? What areas do we need to improve upon to raise our Star Rating? What subgroups in your school are identified for Targeted Support or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement and in what areas?"
7. Inform participants you're going to dig into achievement, growth, and exceeds expectations for English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. These are all different ways to look at performance data on the statewide assessments. The same set of questions and same types of data will be used twice, once for each subject.
8. Navigate to the "Achievement ELA" tab to the right of the current tab. Here you will see several important panels. First, the top left panel shows a table of "cut scores" that determine the number of points schools received for achievement in ELA. The bar graph to the right of this table shows the school's ELA achievement index scores. The dark blue line is the school's ELA performance for all students. The dotted lines correspond to the cut scores on the right-hand table. The solid line in the bar corresponds to the percentage of students who scored proficient.

The Cut-Score Table tells you what Index score you need to achieve each level of points.

Your schools current level is indicated by the orange arrow.

Overvié Achievement - ELA Achievement - Math Growth - ELA $\mid$ Growth - Math $\mid$ English Language Proficiency $\mid$ Graduation
Johnston Senior High School ELA Achievement Measures performance on the SAT and DLM assessments in 2017-18 and 2018-19 combined

Lastly, hovering over the "How is the proficiency index calculated?" panel will show you a school-wide breakdown of the percentage of students that participated in the assessment, and of the participants, how many scored at levels $1,2,3$, and 4 . It further shows how each of those levels contributes to your overall proficiency index, with supporting equations using your schools data.


| This pop-up panel |
| :--- |
| shows you the |
| step-by-step process |
| to calculate your |
| proficiency index. |


| This step shows you |
| :--- |
| the number of |
| students at each |
| performance level of |
| the test |

This is where you hover your mouse to see the pop-up panel

Johnston Senior High School ELA Achievement Measures performance on the SAT and DLM assessments in 2017-18 and 2018-19 combined

Johnston Senior High School's participation rate for ELA accountability is 98\%. 44\% of Johnston Senior High School students are proficient in ELA.
Their ELA proficiency index, which includes partial points for level 2, is 53 out of 100.
 on right.
Four points matches Rl's long-te



How to calculate the proficiency index (for 'All Students'):
Achievement is a two-year measure so these data include both the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years combined.

1) Check whether the participation rate is below $95 \%$. If so, add additional students to Level 1 until the total is at least $95 \%$.

Johnston Senior High's participation rate is $98 \%$. This is at least $95 \%$ so 0 students are added to Level 1 to reach $95 \%$.
2) Calculate the weighted count of students at each level.
[109 Level $1+0$ Nonparticipants added] $\times 0=0$
$\begin{array}{ll}118 \text { Level } 2 \times 33= & 39.3 \\ 149 \text { Level } 3 \times 1= & 149\end{array}$
26Level $4 \times 1=\quad 26$
3) Add up the weights.
$0+39.3+149+26=214.3$
4) Divide this sum by the number of students included and multiply by 100 .
[214.3/402.0] x $100=53$ Blank rows indicate too few students to report.
**Subgroups with 10-19 students are reported, but not included in accountability determinations.
9. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions. Then direct them to answer Question 3: "What do you notice about overall student performance in ELA compared to cut scores? What do you notice for subgroup performance? What do you notice about participation rates for all students and each subgroup? What do you notice about the distribution of students across performance levels? How far away (in index points or number of students) is the school away from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted lines)?"
10. Navigate to the "Growth ELA" tab, two to the right of the "Achievement ELA" tab. This tab similarly has a cut score table, a bar chart, and a panel to hover-over to see growth calculations. The features of the bar chart, including the ability to hover over bars to see numbers of students and participation rate are the same as the Achievement chart.



Sudents who were not enrolled from Oct. 1 through the end of the testing window and students who moved to the US in the past year are not included.
Blank rows indicate too few students to report.
*Subgroups with $10-19$ students are reported, but not included in accountability determinations.
11. Allow participants to answer Question 4: "What do you notice about overall student growth? What do you notice about subgroup growth? What do you notice about growth in light of the ELA proficiency data you just considered? What do you notice about the distribution of students at the low, typical and high growth levels? How far away (in index points or number of students) is the school from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted lines)?"
12. Navigate to the "Exceeds Expectations" tab, the farthest tab to the right (you will need to click on the rightward arrow and scroll through several other tabs to see it). Again we see tables similar to the achievement and growth tabs in layout. You'll notice this has both ELA and Math graphs. Direct participants to focus only on ELA, as they'll return to math shortly. Again there is a cut-score table indicating the schools points. There are also bar graphs. The bars on the graph represent the percentage of students scoring at the highest possible level on the state assessment, meaning they exceed expectations. Hovering over each bar will provide more detail including the number of students that exceeded for each group.

The Cut-Score Table tells you what Index score you need to achieve each level of points.

The bars tell you the percentage of students in ELA who scored a 4 on the state assessment.

```
Hovering over any
bar provides
additional detail, like
the number of
students exceeding
expectations.
```


13. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions. Then have them answer Question 5: "What do you notice about the percentage of students exceeding expectations overall? For subgroups? How far away (in percentage points or number of students) is the school from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted line)?"
14. Repeat steps 8 through 13 for Math Achievement, Math Growth, and Math Exceeds Expectations, allowing participants to answer Questions 6, 7 and 8.
15. Inform participants, if they are analyzing an elementary or middle school they are about halfway through with 4 more indicators to look at. If they are a high school, they will have 3 additional indicators to analyze. You may want to offer participants a break.
16. Navigate to the tab that says English Language Proficiency (ELP). You will see a cut score table on the right, a bar graph on the left, and an explanation of how the ELP indicator is calculated below the cut score table. Note that this table isn't specific to each school like in the previous metrics, and there is no additional information provided in a hover-over detail. Also, be sure to note that ELP is a growth measure on a language acquisition test and progress is measured based on student growth against the amount of time they have been in the program. As with previous charts, all bars reveal additional detail when hovered over.

17. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions. Then ask them to answer Question 9: "What do you notice about ELP indices? The percentage of students meeting targets? The performance of subgroups? How far in index points is the school from achieving the next cut score?"
18. Navigate to the tab that says "Student Absenteeism." You will see a cut score panel, a bar graph showing the percentage of students chronically absent overall and by subgroup, and each bar will provide additional detail when hovered over.

19. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the data. Then have them answer Question 10: "What do you notice about student chronic absenteeism overall? By Subgroup? Do you notice any patterns across subgroup absenteeism and subgroup performance in the previous indicators?"
20. Navigate to the tab that says "Teacher Absenteeism." You will see a cut score panel, a bar graph showing percentages of teachers chronically absent (excluding pre-approved leaves such as long-term illness, sabbatical, or paternity or maternity leave). Note that the subgroups represent the percentage of chronically absent teachers assigned to students of particular groups (for example, if the graph shows you 16\% of teachers of all students in the building are chronically absent and that $8 \%$ of the teachers assigned to students with disabilities are chronically absent, a student with a disability is half as likely to experience an absent teacher than the school average.


Long-term pre-approved absences and absences for professional development are not counted. Teacher counts are weighted by length of assignment and full time status. For subgroups, teacher counts are also weighted by percent of time spent with that subgroup.
*Blank rows indicate too few teachers or students to report
${ }^{\text {*2 }}$ Schools and subgroups with 10-19 teachers or students are reported, but not included in accountability determinations.
21. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the data.. Then have them answer Question 11: ""What do you notice about teacher chronic absenteeism overall? What subgroups are more or less likely to be assigned to a teacher who is chronically absent? Do you notice any patterns across teacher absence and student performance or absenteeism from the previous indicators?"
22. Navigate to the tab that says "Suspension." You will see a cut score panel and a bar graph with all students and subgroup suspension rates (out of 100). You can hover over each bar for additional information about the total number of students and the total number of suspensions.

23. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the data Then have participants answer Question 12: "What do you notice about suspensions overall? What subgroups are most and least likely to be suspended? Do you notice any patterns across subgroup suspension and student performance or absenteeism previously examined? How far is the school away (in suspensions per 100 students) from moving to the next cut score?"
24. If the CSI school being examined is an elementary or middle school, skip steps 26-31.
25. If the CSI school being examined is a high school, tell participants they are going to look at three high school indicators before completing the protocol. You may want to offer them another short break at this point.
26. Navigate to the tab that says "Graduation." You will see a cut score table and a bar chart. The bar with a graph of all students and subgroups, showing their "composite" four, five, and six year graduation rate. Hovering over each bar will also show you the number of students and graduates for both the composite rate and the 4-year graduation rate. Note that the 4-year rate locate a school at the 1 pt and 5pt on the cut table, while the composite rate differentiates between the cuts for 2,3 , and 4 points.
 against the cut

Graduation data are based on 2017 - 18 and earlier. Schools and subgroups with fewer than 20 students have up to two additional years of data added.
*Blank rows indicate too few students to report.
Blank rows indicate too few students to report
"*Subgroups with 10-19 students are reported, but not included in accountability determinations. scores.

27. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the data. Then have them answer Question 13: "What do you notice about graduation rates overall? By subgroup? How far away is the school from the next cut level?"
28. Navigate to the tab that says "Commissioner's Seal." You will see a cut score table and a bar graph indicating the percentage of graduates who are proficient in valid assessments of both ELA and mathematics. Hovering over a bar will reveal a detail panel including the number of graduates in the group, the number proficient in ELA, in math, and in both. Explain that the Commissioner's Seal measures how many graduates have mastered essential high school skills to prepare them for college and career.

29. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the data.. Then have them answer Question 14: "What do you notice about the percentage of students receiving the Commissioner's Seal overall and by subgroup? What do you notice about the Commissioner's Seal percentage and the graduation data and academic data examined previously?"
30. Navigate to the tab that says "Postsecondary Success" (PSS). You will see a cut score table, and a bar graph, indicating an index which rates schools based on the number of students out of all graduates receiving any of the following: AP scores qualifying for college credit, college credit, state-approved CTE credential bundles, and qualifying IB scores. Hovering over the bar graph will provide a detail panel that shows the number of graduates and the percentage of students receiving each of the PSS components listed above. You will also see the percentage of students earning only one, 2 , or $3+$ of the components, as well as the percentage of students that earned none of the above credentials. Explain that PSS measures the number of graduates who, during high school, were able to demonstrate readiness for success in college and careers.

31. Allow participants to ask clarifying questions about the data. Then have them answer Question 15: "What do you notice about the Postsecondary Success index overall? The percentage of students earning each of the various PSS components? What about subgroups? What do you notice about the PSS index compared to the Commissioner's Seal and Graduation Rate data analyzed previously?"
32. Tell participants they have completed the review of accountability indicators. Now tell them to prepare for the prioritization exercise, as a group you will revisit their answers to Question 2 and their analysis of the Star Chart. Let them know they have a blank Star Chart on the back of their notes sheet.
Overview Accountability Assessments Civil Rights Data Educator Data Finance Graduation Rates NAEP Postsecondary Participation

In the accountability tab, you will find the data used to evaluate school performance, from traditional measures like test scores and graduation rates, to broader measures like chronic absenteeism for students and teachers. These data result in a Star Rating for every public school in the state, which simplifies and summarizes overall performance. Further information on RIDE's Accountability system, including a technical manual, is available at http://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability.aspx.

```
Compare With Other Schools Export Chart to PDF Export Chart to Image File Download Data File
* < Overview Achievement - ELA Achievement - Math Growth - ELA Growth - Math English Language Proficiency Graduation ( >
```

Johnston Senior High School earned a 2-Star rating.
The star rating for Johnston Senior High School was driven most by performance on English language proficiency and Diploma Plus.

A school's star rating is the lowest row where points are circled. If a column is missing a circled point score this means there was not enough
information to score that indicator, such as having too few students for that indicator


The she schoor's star rating is calculated, the number of low performing subgroups (rignt-most column) is counted. Alow perfirming subgroup, or subgroup identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) is a subgroup that would earn one star if it were its own school. A subgroup identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) would be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement if it were its own school

Subgroup Identifications (TSI, ATSI, or both): None

Quickly revisit each indicator cut score and demonstrate how the cut scores sum up to determine the levels of performance on the Star Chart. Allow for a discussion of each metric, including how the points combine. Have participants record their notes on Question 16 "Star Chart Review."

Resist participants' inclinations to try to make inferences about causes or propose solutions. Simply objectively summarize all the data and the Participants observations so they understand how each indicator contributes to the overall performance of the school according to this Star Chart.

Once this 10-15 minute discussion is complete, instruct all participants to keep their Question sheets with all their notes, as these will be critical for the next step in the process, which is prioritization of these indicators. Thank Participants and provide them with the meeting date for the Prioritization Protocol which is described in Module 2 Appendix ii.

## Module 2 Appendix i: Identifying Needs Note Taking Sheet

Question 1: "What do you notice about the school's demographic data for teachers and students?"

Question 2: "Overall, what high and low spots do you notice? What areas do we need to improve upon to raise our Star Rating? What subgroups in your school are identified for Targeted Support or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement and in what areas?"

Question 3: "What do you notice about overall student performance in ELA compared to cut scores? What do you notice for subgroup performance? What do you notice about participation rates for all students and each subgroup? What do you notice about the distribution of students across performance levels? How far away (in index points or number of students) is the school away from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted lines)?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 4: "What do you notice about overall student growth? What do you notice about subgroup growth? What do you notice about growth in light of the ELA proficiency data you just considered? What do you notice about the distribution of students at the low, typical and high growth levels? How far away (in index points or number of students) is the school from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted lines)?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 5: "What do you notice about the percentage of students exceeding expectations overall? For subgroups? How far away (in percentage points or number of students) is the school from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted line)?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 6: "What do you notice about overall student performance in math compared to cut scores? What do you notice for subgroup performance? What do you notice about participation rates for all students and each subgroup? What do you notice about the distribution of students across performance levels? How far away (in index points or number of students) is the school away from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted lines)?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 7: "What do you notice about overall student growth? What do you notice about subgroup growth? What do you notice about growth in light of the math proficiency data you just considered? What do you notice about the distribution of students at the low, typical and high growth levels? How far away (in index points or number of students) is the school from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted lines)?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 8: "What do you notice about the percentage of students exceeding expectations overall? For subgroups? How far away (in percentage points or number of students) is the school from the next cut-score (represented by the dotted line)?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 9: "What do you notice about ELP indices? The percentage of students meeting targets? The performance of subgroups? How far in index points is the school from achieving the next cut score?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 10: "What do you notice about student chronic absenteeism overall? By Subgroup? Do you notice any patterns across subgroup absenteeism and subgroup performance in the previous indicators?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 11: ""What do you notice about teacher chronic absenteeism overall? What subgroups are more or less likely to be assigned a teacher who is chronically absent? Do you notice any patterns across teacher absence and student performance or absenteeism from the previous indicators?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 12: "What do you notice about suspensions overall? What subgroups are most and least likely to be suspended? Do you notice any patterns across subgroup suspension and student performance or absenteeism previously examined? How far is the school away (in suspensions per 100 students) from moving to the next cut score?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Questions 13, 14, and 15 apply to high schools only
Question 13: "What do you notice about graduation rates overall? By subgroup? How far away is the school from the next cut level?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 14: "What do you notice about the percentage of students receiving the Commissioner's Seal overall and by subgroup? What do you notice about the Commissioner's Seal percentage and the graduation data and academic data examined previously?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 15: "What do you notice about the Postsecondary Success index overall? The percentage of students earning each of the various PSS components? What about subgroups? What do you notice about the PSS index compared to the Commissioner's Seal and Graduation Rate data analyzed previously?"

Cut score points for this measure:

Question 16 applies to all schools. Be sure to revisit your notes from Question 2 before answering. Note there is a blank Star Chart on the back of this worksheet for you to use.

Question 16: Record your notes from the Star Chart Review Discussion

| Star Rating | Achievement－ ELA and Math （Max． 8 Points） | Growth－ELA and Math（Max． 6 Points） | English <br> Language Proficiency （Max． 4 Points） | Graduation Rate <br> （Max． 5 Points） | Diploma Plus （Max． 6 Points） | Exceeds <br> Expectations， <br> Absenteeism，\＆ <br> Suspension <br> （Max． 15 Points） | \＃of Low－ Performing Subgroups |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6－8 points （3－4 per subject） | 4－6 points （2－3 per subject） | 3－4 points | 4－5 points | 5－6 points | 12－15 points＊＊ | None |
| $\star \star \boldsymbol{*}$ 大 | 5－6 points （2－4 per subject） |  | 2 points |  | 4 points（2＋per measure） | 10－11 points＊＊ | 1 subgroup |
| 大 大 大 | 7－11 tota | l points＊ |  | 3 points | 3－4 points | 7－9 points＊＊ | More than 1 subgroup |
| $\star \star$ | 5－6 tota | points＊ | 1 point | 2 points | 2 points | 5－6 points＊＊ |  |
| $\star$ | 2 points | 2 points |  | 1 point |  |  |  |

