2018-2019 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

North Park Elementary School
Beth Brandenburg
1080 S. Logsdon Parkway
Radcliff, Kentucky, 40160
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/29/2018
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

Rationale: 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 (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 (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. As required by Section 1008 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools must base their program upon a thorough 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?

All stakeholders review grade, school-wide, district, and state level data to determine school strengths and areas of improvement in the following diagnostics: TSG data and past BRIGANCE data for preschool; District Literacy and Math Assessments for Preschool. We review school Literacy First and Math assessments; current BRIGANCE screen data,and MAP data for Kindergarten . Additional data in sub-domains for all content areas are utilized to provide Kindergarten teachers specific data to make more informed decisions on their instructional practices. Intervention/enrichment lessons can be planned to provide targeted instruction for skill groups, as well. Analyses happen in leadership team meetings, PLC meetings, Faculty meetings, and SBDM meetings and are documented in minutes. PLCs meet 2 times per month to review data, Committees meet monthly, SBDM meets monthly. Data reviews (Data Chats) are held quarterly with individual teachers and leadership team. Gaps with subpopulation groups were also analyzed. We review the Parent Title I surveys from the previous Spring, and gave a Teacher and Staff Survey in Fall 2018. Stakeholders look at multiple forms of data to get more valid information to make instructional decisions. Some of the data does not address the transient nature of our population of students. We have multiple programs in place to reduce the many barriers to learning and close gaps. Results are used to designate areas of strengths and weaknesses for our school. These forms of data helped us find the weak or inconsistent areas in our curriculum and instruction. According to this data,reading continues to be the primary weakness for our school. However, although math starts lower, our students perform on average above grade level by the end of the Kindergarten year. The school writing team is working hard to consistently analyze writing data to make informed decisions. TELL survey and Title I parent survey results were used to determine culture and climate needs at North Park.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

eProve diagnostics

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:

-32% of gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.

-We saw a 10% increase among gap students in Reading from 2017 to 2018.

-34% of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 47%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

-Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 87% for the 2017 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2016.

-The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2018 from 276 in 2017.

Current Academic State: According to MAP test Fall 2018 Math K Number Off Grade Level 116 Total # 402 % ON 71.14% % OFF 28.86% Reading K Number Off Grade Level 116 Total # 397 % ON 70.78% % OFF 29.22% This is a slight elevation from Fall 2017 Math ON 68% Reading ON 67% BRIGANCE - NOT READY 46% This is a slight improvement from 2017 NOT READY 48% Current Non Academic State above 40% - students with IEPs

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

eProve diagnostics

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data points.

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

46% of our students come to Kindergarten NOT READY. This has historically translated into difficulty in achieving ON Grade level status in Reading.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Priorities/Concerns

Trends

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

BRIGANCE scores have improved from 2016 40% Not Ready to 48% in 2017 and improved to 46% in 2018.This is still well below our 70-80 READY % goal.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

e|Prove 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](#)

KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Potential Source of Problem

eProve diagnostics

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data.

Example: Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

For the year 2017 (as current as we have showing strengths) Reading MAP: According to MAP Student Growth Summary Report, 87% of students met their projected growth. UP from 66% In 2016-17 34% (96 students) below 158 in Reading. Of that group, 44% (42 students) scored within 5 points of grade level, 36% (35 students) scored between 5-10 points below grade level. 20% (19 students) scored 11 or more points below grade level (17 points = 1 year growth). Compared to last year there was a reduction in total number below grade level 34% vs. 39%. Gap Group (Special Education students)-89.1% met or exceeded projected RIT in Reading. 148.6% percentage of projected growth met. Math MAP: According to the MAP Student Growth Summary Report, 91% of students met their projected growth. UP From 75% in 2016-17 32% (91 students) below 159 in Math. Of that group, 35% (32 students) scored within 5 points of grade level, 22% (20 students) scored between 5-10 points below grade level. 43% (39 students) scored 11 or more points below grade level (19 point = 1 year growth). Compared to last year there was a reduction in total number below grade level 32% vs. 37%. Gap Group (Special Education students)- 88.6% met or exceeded projected RIT in Math. 177.5% percentage of projected growth met. Our Intervention/ Enrichment Program is also a strength that shows how we are able to move students - Intervention Successes: Reading KSI 35 students were identified for KSI in Reading based on MAP scores, Literacy First, and classroom performance throughout the 2017-2018 school year. Interventions were provided and data points were collected and monitored monthly. 3 students moved during their KSI process and are not included in the final count. At the end of the year, 2 students remained in Tier 2 status, 8 students will remain or begin Tier 3 in Fall (1 of the 8 will have a Cognitive Screener). These 8 students made positive growth with the KSI process, but it was determined to keep them in Tier 3 to provide extra support when beginning first grade. 2 students are currently in the Special Education Referral Process. Since winter testing, 18 students transitioned back to core instruction. 9 of students transitioned back to core instruction and 11 students transitioned back to core and received ESS services. No students were unable to be tested due to truancy. 3 students will be retained in Kindergarten for the 2018-2019 school year. Of the 35 students who were in the KSI process for Reading, 25 were present the entire year. Those 25 students had an average growth of 22.7 points on MAP testing from Fall to Spring. Math KSI 34 students were identified for KSI in Math, based on MAP scores and classroom performance throughout the 2017-2018 school year. Interventions were provided and data points were collected and monitored monthly. 3 students moved during their KSI process and are not included in the final count. 2 students remain in Tier 2 status, 8 students will remain or begin Tier 3 in the fall (2 of the 8 will have a Cognitive Screener). These 8 students made positive growth with the KSI process, but it was determined to keep them in Tier 3 to provide extra support when beginning first grade. 2 students are currently in the Special Education Referral Process. Since winter testing, 19 students transitioned back to core instruction. 7 of the students transitioned back to core instruction and 12 students transitioned back to core and received ESS services. No students were unable to be tested due to truancy. 3 students will be retained in Kindergarten for the 2018-2019 school year. Of the 34 students who were in the KSI process for Math, 26 were present the entire year. Those 26 students had an average growth of 26.9 points on the MAP testing from Fall to Spring.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY

Attachment Name	Description	Item(s)

eProve diagnostics