2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10182019_13:21

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Ockerman Elementary School
Kim Best
8250 Us 42 Hwy
Florence, Kentucky, 41042
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?

Data is analyzed on an ongoing basis and the frequency will depend upon the type of data that isbeing reviewed. If data is received in an easy to understand format, it is reviewed as received. If itis delivered in a manner that does not allow for ease of understanding it may be recreated into analternate format for sort-ability, graph creation etc. Data is analyzed to look for strengths,weaknesses, areas for focused intervention. Data results are used to determine next steps forareas of need for professional learning, areas for intervention for students, core instructionmodifications, materials and resources, and staffing decisions. All results are taken into accountwhen decisions are made. Through careful analysis of all data plans and objectives are thendetermined. Data is reviewed during teacher level PLC's, during team leader meetings forinterventions and next steps, during PBIS behavior meetings, special education ARC meetings,instructional team leader meetings, SBDM council meetings, and whole school PLC meetings inaddition to isolated data review to address concerns. The frequency of these meeting vary acrossthe continuum from weekly to biweekly to monthly to quarterly etc. as needed.

Protocol

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 current academic state based upon the 2018-2019 KPREP report has Ockerman Elementary rated as a 3 star school. Our overall score is 68.7 and we received a medium rating for Proficiency (67.7) a medium rating for Separate Academic Indicator (63.8) and Very High for Growth (73.4). We saw an increase in the percentage of students scoring Proficient and Distinguished (P/D) in the area of reading from 46% to 48.8%. The percentage of students scoring Novice in reading decreased from 25.2% to 20.5%. In looking at group trends for Reading, female students increased from 48.8% P/D to 49.7% and decreased novice from 21.1% to 16.8%. Our male students increased from 43.6% P/D to 48.2% and decreased novice from 28.7% to 23.5%. Our Economically Disadvantaged students increased from 39.4% to 45.6% P/D and decreased novice from 29.5% to 24.3%. Our students with disabilities showed a decrease in the P/D from 31% to 26.9% and increased the percentage of novice students from 42.3% to 46.3%. Our Hispanic students continue to show growth as they increased their P/D from 30.8% to 36.15 and decreased novice from 37.4% to 30.2%. In math we saw a significant increase in P/D from 40.7% to 48.8% but a slight increase in the percentage of novice from 17.2% to 19.6%. Our Groups Trends show some variance with our female students increasing P/D from 30.2% to 49% but with a slight increase in novice from 16.9% to 18.1%. Our male students also increased P/D from 42.1% to 48.6% and also had an increase in the percentage of novice from 17.4% to 20.9%. Economically Disadvantaged students increased P/D from 35.7% to 43.7% and increased novice from 10.1% to 23.3%. Students with disabilities showed a decreased of 0.1% for P/D but a sizable increase in the percentage pf novice from 31% to 41.8%. Our Hispanic students showed a large increase from 27.5% to 44/2% and a slight increase in novice from 20.9% to 22.1%. In Science, our students increased from 19.4% P/D to 29.2% P/D and decreased novice from 15.5% to 15%. Our groups trends fluctuated among the demographic groups. Our female students increased P/D from 16.4% to 28.1% and decreased novice from 16.4 to 10.5%. Our male students increased P/D from 22.1 to 30.4% however they had an increase in the percentage of novice from 14.7 to 10^5. Economically Disadvantaged students increased from 15.3% P/D to 21.1% P/D and also had a slight increase in the percentage of novice from 18.8% to 19.7%. Students with disability showed a slight increase from 13.8 to 15% P/D and a large increase in the percentage of novice from 20.7 to 35%. Our Hispanic students showed a decrease in P/D from 12.2% to 3.7% but also a decrease in the novice percentage from 24.4 to 22.2%. Social Studies increased P/D from 47.7% to 54.7% but had a slight increase of novice from 11.7% to 12.7%. The demographic group trends show female students with an increase of P/D from 46.7% to 55.1% and an increase of novice from 13.3% to

15.5%. Male students also showed an increase in P/D percentages going from 48.5% to 54.4% and a slight decrease in novice from 10.6% to 10.3%. Economically disadvantaged students increased P/D from 41.6% to 52.8% and had a slight increase in novice from 15.6% to 16.7%. Students with disability decreased the the percentage of P/D students from 33.3% to 29.6% and increased the percentage of novice from 23.8% to 25.9%. Our Hispanic students increased P/D from 30.8% to 46.6% and decreased novice from 26.9% to 17.9%. In writing we increased from 36% P/D to 45.2% and increased the percentage of novice from 22.5% to 27.8%. The demographic sub groups showed a variance of increases and decreases with our female students increasing P/D from 46.7% to 51.7% however there was a significant increase in the number of novice writers going from 17.8% to 24.1%. Our male students increased from 28.8% to 39.7% but also had and increase in novice writers from 25.8 to 30.9%. Economically disadvantaged students increased the percentage of P/D from 35.3% to 38.9% and increased the percentage of novice from 24.7% to 29.2%. Students with disabilities showed a decrease in the percentage of P/D going from 28.6% to 25.9% and had an alarming increase in novice from 38.1% to 63%. Hispanic students increased the percentage of P/D from 30.8% to 33.4% and decreased the percentage of novice from 34.6% to 30.8%. Growth was an area in which we showed movement in the right direction. Ockerman Elementary had the highest growth out of all schools in the Boone County School District. The lowest area of growth that was experienced was with our sub group of 2 or more races but still had a rating of 64.6. All other sub group areas had growth ratings in the 70's and both Hispanic and ELL had growth ratings in the 80's. In the area of non - academic factors, our behavior referrals data from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 shows decrease in the number of non truancy behavior referrals from 211 in 2017 to 144 in 2018. The majority of behavior referrals (non truancy) are due to disrespectful behavior. Our truancy rates increased significantly during the 2018 - 2019 school year with and increase of 14% compared to the previous year. behavior referrals that are stemming from a particular grade level of students due to environmentalconcerns that are manifesting within the school setting

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

📄 Data Dashboard

📄 KPREP Graphs

📄 KPREP Graphs part 2

📄 Phase 2

📄 Summary Sheet

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.

The area which is of the highest priority is that of students with disabilities. Students in this group consistently performed lower than all other sub groups in all areas. 48.8% of all students scored P/D in reading while only 26.9% did so in the students with disability group. In math 48.8% of all students scored P/D while only 22.4% of students disabilities scored P/D. In the area of writing, 18.2% of students without and IEP scored novice while 63% of students with an IEP scored novice. Overall we had high percentages of novice in all sub groups with students with disabilities and English Language Learners being the two sub groups with the most concerning numbers of novice writers.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

📄 Behavior Analysis

📄 Behavior Analysis 2019-2020

📄 Summary Sheet

Trends

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

In the past two years, we have had difficulty getting our students to proficiency and beyond for reading and math. Although we say increases in both of these areas overall, we still have a long way to go with too large of a population that are not in the proficiency range. Historically math has been a stronger area for us, but the KPREP performance data shows that this area took a decline for many of our subgroups even though we improved overall.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

📄 KPREP Graphs

📄 KPREP Graphs part 2

📄 Phase 2

Trends

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

Delivery of instruction - Continued focus on establishing congruency between standards, learning targets and assessments through weekly PLC meetings with grade level teachers as well as whole school PLC meetings in which student learning is the focus. Continued work will take place in regards to strengthening core instruction for both ELA and mathematics. The implementation of CASE data for ELA and math which will allow progress in regards to the standards to be evaluated and instructional decisions to be made based upon the real time outcomes for students. Walk throughs, lesson plans, guided reading running records, anecdotal notes, assessment data, progress monitoring and student data binders will all be used to analyze student success as a whole as well as to identify areas of needed supports. Student engagement will continue to be a focus with Kagan strategies being implemented across core classes as well as special area clases. Success criteria and goal setting with students will be implemented as well. Guided reading instruction will be implemented in all classrooms to allow for a greater level of differentiation in reading as well as guided math implemented in math classes. RTI processes and procedures will take place to identify students who are in need of additional supports. KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment. Our recent Resiliency Poll data shows increases in the last two years (from 17% optimal to 73% optimal) in the percentage of students who have high ratings for positive school experiences meaning they feel welcome and look forward to coming to school. We will continue to focus on social emotional learning to address other areas such as hope, ostracism and bullying through in school guidance, outside agency resources and collaboration with community and families. In the current year, we will continue to utilize school resources as well as outside agencies to address the significant level of SEL, behavioral and mental health needs of our current population. Student mental health issues continue to present challenges as they have a significant impact on the learning of not only the affected student(s) but also the students in the classroom. Disruptive behavior is the most prevalent behavior concern) other than truancy. In the current school year we will continue to utilize school resources

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%.

Proficiency in ELA and math are on the rise and all gap groups with the exception of students with disabilities have shown improvement. in ELA we increased from 46% to 48.8% for all students and in math we increased from 40.7% to 48.8%. Our KPREP indicator scores were medium for proficiency and separate academic. Our indicator score for growth was very high with a score of 73.4. When looking at growth for gap groups, all groups had growth scores over 70 with some in the 90s.

eProve diagnostics

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
Behavior Analysis	Behavior Analysis from 2018-2019	•
Behavior Analysis 2019-2020		•
Data Dashboard	Overall look at the status of OES from a variety of data sources.	•
KPREP Graphs	Comprehensive Data for KPREP to include gap groups	• •
KPREP Graphs part 2	Comprehensive data	• •
Phase 2	Phase 2 planning cycle	• •
Summary Sheet	Summary of data	• •

eProve diagnostics