



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for  
Schools\_10072020\_13:44

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**Ryland Heights Elementary School**  
**Dan Schacherer**  
3845 Stewart Rd  
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015  
United States of America

---

## 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	8
Trends	9
Potential Source of Problem	10
Strengths/Leverages	11

## **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?

MAP diagnostic data, Reading and Math RTI data, Brigance and Common Assessment data results are reviewed on a consistent basis. Data review occurs weekly with the Administration Team during weekly admin meetings as well as during District Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Meetings. This data is also shared with the entire faculty, grade specific teachers through PLC's, and with the SBDM council on a regular basis. In addition, specific student data is analyzed during weekly PLC grade level meetings and Special Education PLC's. Students identified for interventions and appropriate data is reviewed weekly at MTSS meetings, which includes school admin team, primary and intermediate interventionists, school counselor, school psychologist, lead special education teacher and school/district RBTL interventionists.

## 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.

- 72.69% of all students were above 50th percentile in Reading on Winter Map; an increase of 8.66% from Fall Map - 74.35% of all students were above 50th percentile in Math on Winter MAP; an increase of 6.97% from Fall MAP - 32.81% of all students with IEPs were above 50th percentile in Reading on Winter MAP; an increase of 6.66% from Fall MAP - 43.75% of all students with IEPs were above 50th percentile in Math on Winter MAP; an increase of 6.25% from Fall MAP - The percentage of Reading Gap students below the 20th percentile reduced by 11% from Fall to Winter in MAP (34% to 23%) - The daily average attendance rate was 95.60% for the months of August 2019-February 2020. This daily rate was 1.18% short of our goal (96.78%) - The percentage of chronically absent students (students missing more than 10% of instructional time) was 8.68% for the months of August 2019-February 2020. This percentage was 1.68% short of our goal (7.00%). -There were a total of 130 behavior referrals from August 2019 through February 2020. The two most common areas were classroom (72) and bus (38). - According to the Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey, the highest scoring topic was Managing Student Behavior and more specifically respectful relationships between teachers and students (85% favorability score) and a safe school environment (88%). Conversely, the lowest scoring topic was adequacy of the school's resources (30%). Additionally, a low

number of staff members felt that they had input into individualizing their own professional development opportunities (29%).

## 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.

- 37% of our Gap students were still below the 20th percentile in Reading on the Winter MAP - 67.19% of students with IEPs were below the 50th percentile in Reading on the Winter MAP - 56.25% of students with IEPs were below the 50th percentile in Math on the Winter MAP - 3rd Grade Reading was the only grade level below district average on Winter MAP (-6.18%) - According to the Impact Survey, only 9% of teachers responded favorably that they have input when the school makes important decisions



## Trends

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

- The disparity between all students and students with IEPs on Winter Reading MAP was 34.55% in 2018-19 and 39.88% in 2019-20. - The disparity between all students and students with IEPs on Winter Math MAP was 28.31% in 2018-19 and 30.6% in 2019-20. - There were a total of 130 behavior referrals for the months of August 2019 through February 2020. This was an increase of 48 behavior referrals from the same time span the previous school year.

## 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](#)

We will focus our resources and efforts on KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data in order to improve the noted trends and concerns.

## 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%.

- Percentage of students in Reading above 50th percentile on Winter Map has increased over the past three years (59.72%-69.22%-72.69%). - Percentage of students in Math above 50th percentile on Winter Map has increased over the past three years (55.11%-64.31%-74.35%) - Over 60% of students made growth from Fall to Winter in Reading on the MAP test, with the overall percentage of students above benchmark going up 8.66%. - According to the Impact Kentucky Working Conditions Survey, Ryland Heights Elementary is a very safe environment (88% favorability), where teachers and students have respectful relationships (85%) and the students are enthusiastic about being at school (85%).

# Attachment Summary

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