

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10102019_13:35

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Piner Elementary School
Christi Jefferds
2845 Piner Ridge Rd
Morning View, Kentucky, 41063
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/10/2019
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	4
Protocol	5
Current State	6
Priorities/Concerns	7
Trends	8
Potential Source of Problem.....	9
Strengths/Leverages	10
Attachment Summary	11

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

In its most basic form, continuous improvement is about understanding the **current state** and formulating a plan to move to the **desired state**. The comprehensive needs assessment is a culmination of an extensive review of multiple sources of data collected over a period of time (e.g. 2-3 years). It is to be conducted annually as an essential part of the continuous improvement process and precedes the development of strategic goals (i.e. desired state).

The needs assessment requires synthesis and analysis of multiple sources of data and should reach conclusions about the **current state** of the school/district, as well as the processes, practices and conditions that contributed to that state.

The needs assessment provides the framework for **all** schools to clearly and honestly identify their most critical areas for improvement that will be addressed later in the planning process through the development of goals, objectives, strategies and activities. 703 KAR 2:225 requires, as part of continuous improvement planning for schools, each school complete the needs assessment between October 1 and November 1 of each year and include: (1) a description of the data reviewed and the process used to develop the needs assessment; (2) a review of the previous plan and its implementation to inform development of the new plan; and, (3) perception data gathered from the administration of a valid and reliable measure of teaching and learning conditions. Further, as required by Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools implementing a schoolwide program must base their Title I program on a comprehensive needs assessment.

Protocol

Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results. Include names of school/district councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

At Piner each year, our administrators host a school-wide KPREP Data Analysis PD. It includes all teachers and staff, and the FRC Coordinator. Additionally, our Piner SBDM Council members are invited to attend. We use the KASC Score and Gap Analyzer Tool kit, and identify areas of strength and need. From this, we develop school wide goals for our CSIP. Additionally, data is reviewed throughout the year in a variety of settings. This data is reviewed with the SBDM Council at SBDM meetings in the fall. Teachers, both general and special education, meet weekly in PLCs with the school administrators, and review MAP data following each administration of the test. Additional data analysis is completed in PLCs throughout the year using weekly assessment and common assessment data. Our RTI team (including administrators, classroom teachers, interventionists, and special education teachers) meets in PLCs to review RTI data for academic areas and behavior. Recommendations are made during these meetings regarding the progress or lack of progress of the interventions implemented. MTSS meetings are held to provide support and make a plan for next steps when students are in intensive interventions and there are still concerns of lack of growth. Each student's data is reviewed at least every six weeks; at times, the SAT members may refer students for a special education referral.

Current State

Plainly state the current condition using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by past, current and multiple sources of data. These should be based solely on data outcomes. Cite the source of data used.

Example of Current Academic State:

- Thirty-four (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (54%) of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 57%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

-The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 86 in 2019 from 198 in 2018.-KPREP Reading, 8.48% of students scored novice and 67.87% scored P/D; Reading P/D increased 0.17% and novice decreased 4.12% from 2018 -KPREP Math, 9.09% of students scored novice and 67.87% of students scored P/D; Math P/D increased 2.87% but novice increased 0.39% from 2018-KPREP Science, 8.33% of students scored novice (decrease of 4.37% in 2018) and 48.34% of students scored P/D (increased of 12.04% in 2018)-KPREP Social Studies, 3.45% of students scored novice (decrease of 3.55% in 2018) and 79.31% of students scored P/D (increase of 3.31% in 2018)-KPREP Writing, 20.69% of students scored novice (increase of 7.99% in 2018) and 50% of students scored P/D (increase of 3.5% in 2018)

Priorities/Concerns

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

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

Example: Sixty-eight (68%) of students in the achievement gap scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

-Students scored an overall 85.9 on the proficiency indicator of KPREP; whereas, students with an IEP scored an overall 51.6 on the proficiency indicator.-All students scored a 71.7 on the separate academic indicator in Science of KPREP; whereas, students with an IEP scored an overall 40 on the separate academic indicator in Science.-All students scored a 65.9 on the separate academic indicator in Writing of KPREP; whereas, students with an IEP scored an overall 26.9 score on the separate academic indicator in Writing.

Trends

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

-The special education students are scoring consistently lower than our overall scores by double digits in all areas of the academic index and separate academic indicators on KPREP. This is a trend over the previous 3 years as measured by KPREP.

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](#)

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results. We will continue to refine our weekly assessment implementation and data analysis in reading and math. Teachers will assess one standard at a time following instruction. Teacher will develop instructional plans to remediate students who fail to master the standards, as well as providing extension/enrichment to students who have. Weekly assessments will be reviewed prior to administration by the PLC for standard alignment and appropriate level of rigor; results will be reviewed weekly in PLCs. Teachers will provide their remediation plans at that time, but for students failing to master the standards, or to reteach all students standards that were not mastered.

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%.

-KPREP Reading P/D increased 0.17% and novice decreased 4.12% from 2018. -KPREP Math P/D increased 2.87% from 2018.-KPREP Science P/D increased 12.04% and novice decreased 4.37% in 2018.-KPREP Social Studies P/D increased 3.31% and novice decreased 3.55% in 2018.-KPREP Writing P/D increased 3.5% in 2018.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------