2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_11212019_21:54

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Chester Goodridge Elementary School
Jennifer Patrick
3330 Cougar Path
Hebron, Kentucky, 41048
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/19/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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?

AssessmentsSTAR Assessment: At the beginning of each year, we benchmark our students using the STAR assessment. From the STAR assessment, the Leadership Team, including the RTI Lead Teachers, each classroom teacher and the FFW lab manager, listed all students in grades 2-5 who projected to score Novice. We discussed each students' classroom work, teacher anecdotal notes and student's Fountas and Pinnell reading level. If the data triangulated, we placed them on the Fast ForWord program, 5 days a week for a minimum of 30 minutes each day. For students in Grade 1 who scored "Urgent Intervention" or "Intervention" on STAR Early Literacy, we continued the same practice. All students in Kindergarten are scheduled on a 3-Day Protocol in the Fast ForWord program with the goal of at least completing Reading Readiness.For our most struggling learners, we offered smaller groups of Leveled Literacy Intervention in Reading and Bridges in Math, provided by various staff members. KPREP:For our most struggling learners, we offered smaller groups of Leveled Literacy Intervention provided by various staff members. Our struggling learners in math are provided smaller groups of Bridges intervention. CASE:CASE assessment is taken by all students. The data is compared to STAR to form instructional groups.Collaboration & CommunicationRTI Lead Teachers, Intervention Service Providers, Classroom Teachers and the FFW Lab Manager are to meet to discuss student data bi-monthly. Topics discussed are areas of deficits and interventions to be provided. Benchmark Reading Assessments Benchmark Literacy Running RecordsStudents are administered the Benchmark Literacy Running Records and are grouped appropriately for Guided Reading Groups.Benchmark Running RecordsWe also use the Benchmark Running Record to determine students who are multiple years behind the expected level. Once we assessed the need, we created a schedule so that students can receive instruction using the Leveled Literacy Intervention program. Based upon the research for students reaching reading proficiency by the end of third grade, we aggressively targeted our 2nd grade students. We administer three times a year. Comprehension Skill AssessmentStudents are given a CSA in each unit, and Benchmark Literacy offers a mid-year comprehensive assessment. Common Classroom AssessmentsWe are in the process of assuring our classroom assessments target standards and that our test taking strategies are effective and aligned. We are working specifically on pre-assessments that point to an area of understanding on the continuum and post-assessments that reflect grade-level rigor. Collaboration & CommunicationPLCs - We are the infancy stage of effective Professional Learning Communities. We are beginning to implement a Guided Unit Planning Process to bring attention to standards and prerequisite skills to mastery of standard(s).SSTs - Student Support TeamWhen teachers have behavioral or academic concerns, they refer the conversation to our Student Support Teams. We come together to review the data and determine appropriate interventions and/or resources moving forward. This can include an administrator, a counselor, the school psychologist,Special education teacher, and the classroom teacher. Our SST team meets at least twice weekly to discuss the progress of students who are identified as receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. ATMs – Advisory Team MeetingsAdministrators, Counselors, Instructional Coach, Classroom Teacher and School Psychologist meet two to three times a year to look at data and discuss student growth and determine the effectiveness of provided interventions.

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.

Current State:Current Academic State:-61% of all of our students scored Proficient/Distinguished on K-PREP Reading.-We saw an 11% increase in Reading Proficient/Distinguished Students.-52% of our students are Proficient/Distinguished on K-PREP math.-We saw a 7% increase in Math Proficient/Distinguished Students. -We saw 7% increase in Students with Disabilities in Math-We saw 13% increase in Students in Disabilities in Reading Non-Academic State:- Teacher Attendance: Our teacher attendance has remained close to 95% for the past several years. Teacher attendance was 91% for 2018-2019 school year. - Optimal Positive School Experience increased on the Resiliency Poll from 45% to 73%.

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.

81% of our students with an IEP scored below proficiency in Math on the K-PREP assessment. 48.2% of students in our Free/Reduced-Price Meals gap scored below proficiency in Reading on the K-PREP assessment. 57.2% of students in our Free/Reduced-Price Meals gap scored below proficiency in Math on the K-PREP assessment.

eProve diagnostics

Trends

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

We are consistently maintaining our percentages of Novices and Apprentice students in all areas. We have placed an intense focus on finding each student's point of breakdown and instructing from there. We have decreased our behavior referrals this year as both staff and students understand the expectations.

eProve diagnostics

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](#)

In our PLC work, we will look at deconstructing the standards so that we can write student-friendly learning targets. We will then look at the quality of our assessment to ensure that it addresses the depth of the grade-level standard(s). We will administer pre-assessments to determine students point of instruction on the continuum to the mastery of the standard(s). From there, we will look at designing our instruction to include best practice/high yield instructional strategies. This forces us into critiquing our RTI system. We are also spending time this year making sure our work is modified correctly and students are advocating for their accommodations.

Potential Source of Problem

eProve diagnostics

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%.

In 2018-2019, we increased our Proficient and Distinguished Math students by 7.5%. We increased our Proficient and Distinguished Reading students by 11.1%.

eProve diagnostics

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)

eProve diagnostics