Timpanogos - NEEDS ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FY24
FY2023 EOY Data Summary - Please provide a brief summary of your school data analysis & identified needs

Date(s) of data analysis team meetings: June 7, 2023, June 20-21, 2023, July 5, 2023, August 9, 2023 (reviewed needs and plan with teachers)

Team members: Allison Ferguson, Carrie Rawlins, Kate Pace and Pahoran Marquez (shadow intern)

Data Source	Did you meet your goal(s)? Summary of need(s)/Guiding questions: ● Did you identify grade levels/teachers with specific needs? ● Did you identify specific subgroups with specific needs? (i.e. EL, SWD) ● Do you have specific learning goals? ● Do you have specific PD needs/goals? ● Do you have identified parent engagement needs? ● Do you have identified ML (EL) needs?			
Acadience Proficiency *Consider looking at deep analysis (2nd table); if you need help finding these data points in Amplify, let Tiffany, Michelle or Ron know (june); new assessment dir. in July*	Our goals (fy23) were: **Our goal (fy23) was to have at least 65% of each grade level proficient in Acadience on the EOY assessment. After looking at the data, only 62% of our students were proficient. We'd like to increase that in fy24 to 67% of our students proficient in Acadience.**			

Percent Proficient on Acadience OR questions to the left (two tables below/pick one or use both)

	Acadience Proficiency fy22 (composite)	Acadience Proficiency fy23 (composite)	ML Acadience Proficiency fy22 (composite)	ML Acadience Proficiency fy23 (composite)
Overall	58%	62%	45%	49%
Kinder	59%	89% (8 NTTC)	43%	85%
1st	Overall 61% Dual 58% English Only 65%	Overall 57% (6 NTTC) Dual 68% English Only 43%c	45%	38%
2nd	Overall 46%	Overall 64% (4 NTTC)	34%	46%

	Dual 48% English Only 43%	Dual 68% English Only 52%		
3rd	Overall 62% Dual 73% English Only 48%	Overall 56% Dual 63% (6 NTTC) English Only 50%	51%	46%
4th	Overall 61% Dual 63% English Only 58%	Overall 52% Dual 61% (7 NTTC) English Only 41%	44%	39%
5th	Overall 52% Dual 59% English Only 48%	Overall 57% Dual 56% (4 NTTC) English Only 58%	45%	37%
6th	Overall 64% Dual 51% English Only 74%	Overall 59% Dual 59% English Only 59% (3 NTTC)	49%	53%

Summary: Overall our school went up 4% in proficiency. We had a large number (38) of new to the country students which affected our EL proficiency and our overall proficiency due to the sheer number of NTTC students.

Need: Looking at the data, we noticed that our 2nd grade dual students went up 10% in proficiency from 1st grade. 3rd grade dual students also went from 48% to 63%, a 15% gain. 6th grade English only classes went from 48% to 59% proficient, an 11% gain. 3rd and 6th grade ML students saw significant gains.

We see a need for extra support in reading in the English only classes, as generally, they have a lower percent of their class proficient.

fy24 Goal(s): We would like to increase each grade level's proficiency by 5%. We would also like to increase our overall proficiency from 62% to 67%.

Deep analysis - Tier 1 and Tier 2/3 effectiveness:

Question	Data Source	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Is our core instruction effective? *-Effective is defined as at least 80% of students meeting grade level benchmarks from core instruction alone.*	*-Percentage of Students At or Above Benchmark Combine Green % and Blue %*	89%	57%	64%	56%	52%	57%	59%
What percentage of students who were at or above benchmark at the beginning of the year (BOY) are at or above Benchmark at the end of the year (EOY)? (Tier 1) *-Should be at least 95% of students. Blue/green stayed there*	*-Combine Green % and Blue % for Benchmark* *-Combine Green % and Blue % for Above Benchmark* **263 of 283 students 93%**	97%	87%	98%	93%	98%	87%	92%
<mark>**What percentage of students who were Below Benchmark at BOY are Benchmark/ Above Benchmark at EOY? (Tier 2)** *-Should be at least 80% of students.*</mark> *Yellow moved to Blue/Green*	*-Combine Green% and Blue% for Below Benchmark* 38 of 61 students 62%	100%	54%	43%	71%	33%	65%	0% (0 of 2)
How many students who were Below Benchmark at the BOY are now Well	*-Red% in Below Benchmark column*	0%	3%	14% (1 of 7)	14% (1 of 7)	0%	5%	50% (1 of 2)

Below Benchmark at EOY? (Tier 2 & 3) -Should be 0% of students Yellow moved to Red	8 of 61 students 13%							
What percentage of those who were Well Below Benchmark at the BOY are no longer Well Below Benchmark at EOY? (Tier 2 & 3) *-At least 80% should no longer be Well Below Benchmark Red moved out of Red*	*-Below, Benchmark, Above (add yellow, green, blue% from red column)* 105 of 224 students 47%	95%	54%	36%	42%	26%	38%	5%

Summary: We noticed that a high percentage of students who are yellow or red at BOY did not move to proficiency.

Need: to look at interventions are the yellows getting and how can we improve and focus on these yellow students, Our red kids aren't moving out of red enough, we need to look at both of them- right interventions? quality intervention? intensity needs to be increased,

fy24 Goal(s): We want 80% of our students who are in yellow to move to green or blue by the end of the year. Each teacher will choose 5 yellow students at the beginning of the year to focus on, and provide monthly reports of how they're doing.

Acadience Progress/POP

Our fy23 goal(s) were: We wanted the whole school to be at 75% and we met that goal.

Data analysis:

	fy22	fy23	fy22 ML	fy23 ML
Kinder	59%	95%	45%	92% (7 of 8 NTTC)
1st	63%	75%	41%	62% (2 of 6 NTTC)
2nd	87%	80%	92%	73% (2 of 4 NTTC)

3rd	84%	79%	74%	79% (3 of 6 NTTC)
4th	65%	71%	61%	64% (6 of 7 NTTC)
5th	75%	65%	63%	61% (3 of 4 NTTC)
6th	54%	64%	55%	73% (2 of 3 NTTC)
Whole School	70%	76%	63%	72%

Summary:
76% of our students made typical or above growth in Acadience, this met our goal of 75%.

Teacher POP analysis/progress monitoring/Tier 1/Tier 2 instruction needs: Reiterate to the faculty that we need to continue progress monitoring with fidelity. At the beginning of the year, we are planning to hold an Admin PLC, where we are going to focus on data by grade level and individually.

fy24 Goal(s): We decided to set our goal to 81% for fy24. We also met our ML goal of 70% , when we achieved 72%. We like to increase our ML typical or above growth on Acadience from 72% to 77% for fy24.

RISE ELA Proficiency/Growth - missing growth scores until Oct.	Our goal during fy23 was: Our goal was to increase our overall school's proficiency by 5%, from 26% to 31%

	fy22	fy23 (raw data)	SPED fy22	SPED fy23	ML fy22	ML fy23
3rd*	30%	20%	0% (11)	6% (1 of 18)	14%	10%
4th*	25%	22%	23% (13)	8% (1 of 12)	9%	3%
5th	23%	25%	0% (15)	21% (3 of 14)	9%	6%
6th	26%	28%	0% (8)	6% (1 of 17)	0%	21%
Whole School	26%	23%	5.75%	10%	8%	10%

Summary: We did not meet our goal of 31%, we went down from 26% to 23% proficiency. Every grade had less than

	30% proficiency. Need: We need all grade levels to improve their proficiency on the RISE test. 4th grade SPED students need a ton of additional support in reading. We have made the master schedule to provide these students extra support from SPED teachers. *Most impacted Co-Vid Groups (19-20 K/1st, 20/21 1st/2nd) fy24 Goal(s): Our goal is to improve from 23% to 30% of the whole school proficient for fy24.	

RISE MA Proficiency/Growth - missing growth scores until Oct.

Our goal during fy23 was: Our goal was to increase our overall school's proficiency by 5%, from 33% to 38% (according to raw data). That did not happen this year. We went down 2%.

RISE Math Proficiency

	fy22	fy23 (raw data)	SPED fy22	SPED fy23	ML fy22	ML fy23
3rd	29%	28%	0% (0/10)	6% (1 of 18)	17%	14%
4th	33%	33%	23% (3/13)	8% (1 of 12)	14%	18%
5th	25%	34%	0% (0/17)	21% (3 of 14)	12%	18%
6th	43%	35%	0% (0/8)	12% (2 of 17)	15%	28%
Whole School	33%	31%	6%	11%	10%	19%

Summary: All grades increased slightly in their proficient percentages. 6th grade had 10% more of that class achieving proficiency than had the previous year. We dipped in our whole school proficiency because last year's 6th grade had a higher percent than this year's current 3rd grade.

Need: We noticed small gains in each grade. Our 6th grade increased the amount of students proficient by 10% from the previous year.

fy24 Goal(s): We would like to set a goal of increasing our overall proficiency by 5%, from 31% to 36%.

Into Math Growth

Into Math Growth Measure

	fy22 Into Math Growth (Proficiency)	fy23 Into Math Growth (Proficiency)	fy22 Into Math Growth Full Year's Growth	fy23 Into Math Growth Full Year's Growth	fy22 Into Math Growth Half Year's Growth	fy23 Into Math Growth Half Year's Growth
K	didn't take it	53%		(no BOY)		(no BOY)
1st	93%	73%		50%		21%
2nd	83%	61%		47%		15%
3rd	61%	56%		71%		10%
4th	67%	49%		66%		13%
5th	60%	55%		68%		7%
6th	63%	49%		61%		14%
Whole School	72%	57%		60%		14%

Summary: Questions we asked….timing of the test, test overload from other tests, maybe teachers feel that the test doesn't give them useful data? We had one teacher not administer the test in kindergarten. Kindergarten did not take the BOY portion, so there isn't data to compare to their EOY.

Need: We want to continue improving both our proficiency and growth at all grade levels..

fy24 Goal(s): Our goal is to have students make a full year's growth on the Into Math Growth Measure Test. We want to improve our whole school full year growth from 60% to 70%. As based on the paired test graph from Michelle, comparing BOY and EOY scores (from merge data document GM Summary tab).

RISE Science	Our goal during fy23 was: 5% increase in RISE scores from fy22 to fy23 for all 4th-6th students, going from 28% proficiency to 33% proficient.

		fy22	fy23	SPED fy 22	SPED fy23	EL fy 22	EL fy23
	4th	29%	26%	23% (13)	17% (2 of 12)	5% (2 of 35)	7% (3 of 41)
	5th	23%	36%	0% (15)	29% (4 of 14)	9% (3 of 35)	9% (3 of 34)
	6th	32%	37%	0% (15)	18% (3 of 17)	7% (3 of 41)	16% (5 of 32)
	Whole School	28%	33%	9% (33)	21% (9 of 43)	7% (8 of 111)	10% (11 of 107)

Summary: We met our goal of a 5% increase in proficiency on the RISE Science test. We noticed that our SPED and EL students went up in every grade.

Need: We want to continue improving our proficiency at all grades.

fy24 Goal(s): Increase whole school proficiency from 33% to 38% in FY24.

ACCESS for MLs
• Proficiency
• Growth
• Students who reached proficiency

Refer to USBE WiDA growth chart for accurate growth measures; Use Ellevation report

fy23 Goals: Last year (fy23), our goal was to have 55% of our ELL students making sufficient growth, which we identified as .4 growth on the composite ACCESS score. We made that goal by 11%. 66% of our students made their growth goal on the ACCESS. We would like to increase those that make sufficient growth from 66% to 70% in fy24.

	fy 22 1	fy 23 1	fy 22 2	fy 23 2	fy 22 3	fy 23 3	fy 22 4	fy 23 4	fy 22 5	fy 23 5	fy 22 6	fy 23 6	fy22 school	fy23 school
Meet Growth Goal	83%	90%	57%	70%	31%	61%	74%	87%	50%	61%	8%	17%	49%	66%

Did Not Meet Growth Goal	17%	10%	43%	30%	69%	39%	26%	13%	50%	39%	92%	84%	51%	34%
Minimal Growth (some growth not goal)	13%	0%	23%	4% (1)	41%	9% (4)	16%	3% (1)	16%	11% (3)	14%	17% (4)	20%	7% (13)
No Growth or Negative	4%	10% (3)	20%	26% (7)	28%	30% (13)	10%	10% (3)	34%	29% (8)	78%	67% (16)	32%	27% (50)

Summary:
This year, we used the WIDA growth chart (EL Adequate Progress Targets) to identify which students made their growth goal. Teachers identified this by using the report from Data Gateway.

As a school overall:
66% met sufficient growth
7% made minimal growth
27% made no or negative growth

Four students scored at least a 5 on ACCESS this year, as compared to 7 students the year before.

24 students scored 4.5-4.9, barely missing out on passing the ACCESS test. 15 of the 24 are 4th and 5th grade

	students. With new Data as 4.2 as a cut off for exiting ELL status–we have 38 who have passed out. 6th grade is a concern. Students should be making growth there, but for the past couple of years, they have seen very little growth at all. Need: We want to continue improving growth. We also would like to increase the amount of students scoring at least a 5 on ACCESS. Each teacher will choose any students with a 4.5-4.9 ACCESS score to be one of their 5 focus students, and provide monthly reports of how they're doing. Include those focus students who lack in writing skills in a writing focused intervention group taught by a teacher (can include other students as well). fy24 Goal(s): Using the same method to determine whether adequate growth is made, we want to increase the number of students meeting their growth goal from 66% to 71% FY24.
Stakeholder Survey Use school/district survey results to determine needs for parent engagement/student needs	According to past surveys, many parents were happy that the whole school was using Remind to communicate with parents. They appreciated more communication, but as always wanted more.
EL - other areas **SWD - other areas** • Evaluate students who met proficiency • Evaluate enrollment in gifted/choice programs; Special Education • Evaluate standard reports • Evaluate attendance, mobility, suspension rates	EL and SWD proficiency levels are listed above. On the RISE ELA, EL proficiency went from 8% to 10%. 6th grade increased significantly, but the other grade levels went down. On the RISE Math, EL proficiency went from 10% to 19%. On the RISE ELA, SWD proficiency went up in all grades, except for 5th grade. On the RISE Math, SWD proficiency went from 6% to 11%. We had _____ school suspensions. __ of the __ (__%) were EL students. 294 EL students (school wide) 153 EL students are in Dual Immersion DLI totals 278 52% of our EL students are enrolled in the Dual Immersion classes (major choice program at TImp) 55% of our dual immersion students are ELstudents.

			__% of our EL students also have a SPED classification. 31% of our population are at-risk for attendance, meaning they have missed more than 20% of the school days (36 of the 180 days) 44% of our 188 students at-risk for attendance were EL students.

Panorama/SEL Data
PBIS Data

SEL Analysis on Panorama by Grade Level
How many are on track in SEL, using this scale (80 excellent, 65-79 good, 55-64 fair, 63- poor)?
3rd- 61%
4th- 80%
5th- 72%

71% of students in grades 3rd-6th rated their SEL as excellent or good.

Behavior Analysis on Panorama by Grade Level

How many are on track in behavior, using Panorama data?

	Percentage of students without significant behaviors incidents fy22	Percentage of students without significant behaviors incidents fy23
K	90%	89%
1st	98%	91%
2nd	90%	85%
3rd	89%	74%
4th	82%	79%
5th	86%	86%
6th	92%	88%
Female (whole school)	96%	94%

Male (whole school)	83%	77%
Caucasian (whole school)	88%	82%
All Other Ethnicities (whole school)	90%	87%

We had 447 office referrals and 924 minor incidents reported during the FY23

Summary: We have more male students with behavior incidents than female students, thus it's externalizing their behaviors. There is some inconsistency amongst teachers in reporting incidents and sending students to the office.

SET Survey showed 63% in Monitoring and Decision Making- Recommendations: share Educator Handbook Data with Faculty and Staff 3 times per year at Faculty meeting- Oct, Feb(after SEPs), Apr; post "Tigers Give me 5" in hallways and Cafeteria; Share Educator Handbook Data weekly at SST meeting

Need: We would like all teachers to report behavior incidents consistently. We will have a Wellness Room and a behavior specialist, who will help train teachers on how to appropriately identify and respond to minor and major incidents. We hope that this will help with consistency. We also feel like the Wellness Room will be preventative with certain students to help them learn to regulate themselves before they make poor choices that affect themselves and others.

fy24 Goal(s): We would like to reduce the number of office referrals by 20%, which would be about 89 referrals. We would like to share Educator Handbook Data with Faculty and Staff 3 times per year at Faculty meeting- Oct, Feb(after SEPs), Apr