



## 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Camden Station

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**Camden Station Elementary School**

**Stuart Martin**

6401 West Highway 146  
Crestwood, Kentucky, 40014  
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?

The data was analyzed by the Building Leadership team, CSIP Team (Team Leaders), grade level teams, SBDM council and the PTO. These stakeholders shared the data with the people they represent, and then provided analysis to the Building Leadership team. The Building Leadership team then incorporated the analysis into a more comprehensive response.

## 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.

- On 2018-19 KPREP, We've received a 4 star rating (Overall Accountability Score of 73.3) on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Reading proficiency for all students has increased from 63.6 to 69.7 on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, The percentage of novice in reading has gone down 12.3%-11.2% on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Achievement gap for students from poverty in reading has gone down from 35.2-20.1 on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Math proficiency for all students has increased from 61.3 to 63.3 on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, The percentage of novice in math has gone down 11.5%-10.9% on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Social Studies proficiency for all students has increased from 57.5-60.7 on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Writing proficiency for all students has increased from 39.1-52.3 on KPREP.
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Decrease in science proficiency (43.3 in 18-19 from 57.6 in 17-18) on KPREP.
- Grade Level Percent of Students Falling in Average-High Range (41%ile-80%ile) on Fall 2020 MAP K Math: 90% Reading: 94% 1 Math: 73% Reading: 67% 2 Math: 70% Reading: 71% 3 Math: 62% Reading: 70% 4 Math: 54% Reading: 79% 5 Math: 74% Reading: 83% OVERALL: Math: 70.5% Reading: 77.3%
- Students With Disabilities:
  - o On 2018-19 KPREP, Growing Achievement Gap in Reading (GAP 39.4% from 18.8 in 17-18) on KPREP.
  - o On 2018-19 KPREP, Growing Achievement Gap in Math (GAP 35.4% from 22.6 in 17-18) on KPREP.
  - o On 2018-19 KPREP,

Growing Achievement Gap in Social Studies (GAP 30.9% from 23.6 in 17-18) on KPREP. o On 2018-19 KPREP, Mild Gain in Achievement Gap in Writing (GAP 40.1% from 44.4 in 17-18) on KPREP. • Students from Poverty: o On 2018-19 KPREP, Growing Achievement Gap in Math (GAP 35.2% from 28 in 17-18) on KPREP. o On 2018-19 KPREP, Growing Achievement Gap in Social Studies (GAP 33% from 31.9 in 17-18) on KPREP. o On 2018-19 KPREP, Growing Achievement Gap in Writing (GAP 39% from 26.5 in 17-18) on KPREP. o On 2018-19 KPREP, Growing Achievement Gap in Science (GAP 36.4% from 18.6 in 17-18) on KPREP.

## 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.

- On 2018-19 KPREP, Decrease in science proficiency (43.3 in 18-19 from 57.6 in 17-18)
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Students With Disabilities:
  - o Growing Achievement Gap in Reading (GAP 39.4% from 18.8 in 17-18)
  - o Growing Achievement Gap in Math (GAP 35.4% from 22.6 in 17-18)
  - o Growing Achievement Gap in Social Studies (GAP 30.9% from 23.6 in 17-18)
  - o Mild Gain in Achievement Gap in Writing (GAP 40.1% from 44.4 in 17-18)
- On 2018-19 KPREP, Students from Poverty:
  - o Growing Achievement Gap in Math (GAP 35.2% from 28 in 17-18)
  - o Growing Achievement Gap in Social Studies (GAP 33% from 31.9 in 17-18)
  - o Growing Achievement Gap in Writing (GAP 39% from 26.5 in 17-18)
  - o Growing Achievement Gap in Science (GAP 36.4% from 18.6 in 17-18)



## Trends

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

Based on 18-19 KPREP Data: • Reading and Math NAPD data steadily increasing over last few years. • Reading growth consistently going up since 16-17. • Novice decreasing in reading on KPREP. • Novice decreasing in math on KPREP. • Increased percentage of free/reduced lunch students in attendance. • Most concerning GAP populations are students from poverty, students that qualify for EL services and students with disabilities (increasing). Based on Fall 2020 MAP Data: -Increase in novice percentage for almost all grades in both reading and math -Similar trends in 18-19 KPREP data as in MAP (4th grade reading only exception) for proficiency -Percentage of identified Distinguished students decreasing for 4th grade -Similar trends in 18-19 KPREP data as in MAP for distinguished identification -Percentage of identified Proficient/Distinguished students decreasing for 4th grade reading -The percentage of PD this year is lower than our 3 year average for most grades in reading % of PD is lower this year on MAP as compared to KPREP 2018-19.

## 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](#)

Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy: • School must ensure we have a balanced assessment system • Teachers and staff must ensure that we are keeping stakeholders informed of assessment results • Teachers and staff must ensure assessments are valid and in congruence with standards • Teachers must ensure they are providing timely and specific feedback to students. • The grading system must communicate student learning • Students should have opportunities to communicate their learning and track their progress through goal setting. Review, analyze and apply data results: • Teachers must ensure that assessments in both reading and math are of high quality and aligned to the rigor of the standards. • The school must have systems in place to ensure that student data in both reading and math is collected, analyzed, and being used to drive classroom instruction. • The teachers must use data in reading and math to determine students' needs (e.g., movement through the tiers of intervention, grouping/regrouping, teacher placement, scheduling) • Students should have opportunities to communicate their learning and track their progress through goal setting.

## 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%.

- Camden continues to score higher than the state in most subject areas • In 2018-19, Reading: 86.5% P/D (Camden) vs. 71.9% P/D (State) • In 2018-19, Math: 82.7% P/D (Camden) vs. 69% P/D (State) • In 2018-19, Social Studies: 79.2% P/D (Camden) vs. 72.4% P/D (State) • In 2018-19, Science: 67.5% P/D (Camden) vs. 58.4% P/D (State) • In 2018-19, Writing: 71.5% P/D (Camden) vs. 62.4% P/D (State) • We have a cohesive staff that feels trusted to make sound instructional decisions (93.6% strongly agree/agree). They feel that Camden is a great place to work and learn (93.6% strongly agree/agree) as revealed by TELL-like results in 2019.

# Attachment Summary

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