



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_10262020_00:54

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Centerfield Elementary School
Krista Mornar
4512 Centerfield Drive
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	7
Trends	8
Potential Source of Problem	9
Strengths/Leverages	10
Attachment Summary	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?

Leadership Team (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Guidance Counselor & Library Media Specialist) meets to review school level/"big" data and academic screeners to monitor proficiency and growth in Reading, Math and Writing (Cold Writes/On Demand). Data protocols are used to capture analysis and next steps identified in these meetings. Analysis is also then shared with staff and SBDM committee and can be the catalyst for new initiatives, changes in programming, revised budgets, and the allocation of human resources/schedule changes. Grade Level Professional Learning Communities (K-5) include homeroom teachers, specialists that work with that grade level (ECS/RTI/EL) and Instructional Coach or Assistant Principal. This team meets weekly to dive deep into our new curricular resources (Eureka Math for 3-5 & Lucy Calkins Reading Units of Study for K-2) and to plan engaging, rigorous lessons and common assessments that align with the standards--taking into account student data to differentiate for each learner. In addition to those collaborative planning sessions, this team meets at least twice a month in "just in time" meeting to respond to common formative or summative data. PLC teams utilize data protocols to review "big" data like academic screeners, diagnostic assessments, etc. (MAP, DRA, Brigance, K-PREP, Cold Writes/On Demand Writing), reflect on instructional implications and make appropriate changes in response to their data. Within our MTSS structure, grade level PLCs and Interventionists meet monthly in Tier Talks to discuss more in depth the plans and progress for those students accessing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. A Tier 3 committee meets monthly to review individual cases for students struggling to make accelerated progress despite high levels of support. This committee makes recommendations about next steps that may include changes to intervention plan or referral for special education services or 504 plan. The school-level MTSS Team reviews screener data regularly throughout the school year to ensure all at-risk and/or students scoring far below benchmark gain access to appropriate interventions. The same process is meant to keep up with programming for students who are accelerated learners in need of enrichment.

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.

PROFICIENCY Reading: On 2020 Fall MAP, 60% of 5th graders, 64% of 4th graders, and 49% of 3rd graders scored in the Proficient/Distinguished projection range in Reading. (26% of 3rd graders scored in the Distinguished projection range.) This is statistically similar to the actual KPREP results from 2019, when 57.5% of 3rd, 4th, & 5th graders scored Proficient/Distinguished. Math: On 2020 Fall MAP, 47% of 5th graders, 48% of 4th graders, and 42% of 3rd graders scored in the Proficient/Distinguished projection range in Math. This is significantly lower than the 2019 K-PREP results, when 51.9% of 3rd, 4th & 5th graders scored Proficient/Distinguished. Writing, Science, Social Studies: At this time, there is no current data to report in these areas.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

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.

Reading - 23% of 5th grade students and 20% of 3rd grade students scored in the Novice projection band on Fall 2020 MAP Reading. 31% of 2nd graders and 27% of 1st graders scored in the Low/Low Average range on Fall 2020 MAP Reading. Math - 38% of 5th grade students, 37% of 4th grade students scored in the Apprentice projection band on Fall 2020 MAP Math. 25% of 3rd grade students scored in the Novice projection band on Fall 2020 MAP Math. In addition, 27% of 2nd graders scored in the Low/Low Average range on Fall 2020 MAP Math. Kindergarten Readiness - Only 54% of students scored "Ready" or "Ready with Enrichments" on Brigance Screener. 46% scored "Ready with Interventions" indicating they will need additional support to make adequate progress towards grade-level benchmarks.

Trends

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

When comparing Math and Reading proficiency, as measured by Fall MAP data, there is a considerable difference between the % Proficient/Distinguished in these two CORE subjects. Math is noted as a relative weakness, with the Intermediate grade level groups performing 7-16% points lower in Math than in Reading. Based on Fall 2020 MAP data, the % Distinguished in Reading has increased over the past few years. This is likely the result of the intentional decision to include ALL students in Guided Reading, Kindergarten to 5th grade, even those students above grade level. We have also utilized Lexia Core 5, an adaptive digital resource to support reading skill development in the past two years. This was a beneficial instructional tool during NTI last year when we weren't able to continue small group instruction in the traditional sense. In contrast, there remains a high number of students in the Novice band in Reading on Fall 2020 MAP, 15-23% in Intermediate grades. Almost half of our entering Kindergarten students did not score "Ready" or higher on the Brigance entry screener. This is a higher number than in year's past. Without Writing data from KPREP, we have only been able to rely on our on-demand writing samples collected recently when most students returned to in-person learning. PLC teams have analyzed these cold writes and started the targeted work of identifying specific instructional needs to address within core workshop time. A brief review of this data shows that there is catch-up growth to be made in all areas of writing, despite the intentional work of our core program last school year. This will continue to be an area of focus for us, as we know improvement in writing means improvement across all content areas.

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](#)

Over the past few years, our PLC teams have worked to establish essential standards in Reading, Writing, and Math. We have intentionally spent time aligning our beliefs about teaching/learning and diving deep into trusted curricular resources that support a guaranteed and viable curriculum across grade levels. Shared learning around common formative assessment has helped us understand the critical purpose of assessment in the learning process. PLC teams began reviewing data with specific protocols last school year in at least one focus content area. The next steps for our teams include applying this data review to all content areas and enhancing their discussion about the causal actions that led to the data collected. By analyzing data by standard, teams will be able to pinpoint instructional needs. Developing transparency about learning goals with students and families through a shift to Standards Based Grading is a BIG ROCK this year. Ultimately, we also desire to empower students to lead in their learning by utilizing feedback from rubrics/learning progressions, conferring sessions, formative/ summative assessments to inform their own goal-setting and enhance their understanding of their progress towards mastery of standards. These next steps are elements of Key Core Work Process 4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data.


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%.

Based on Fall 2020 MAP results, we maintained overall Proficient/Distinguished students in the area of Reading in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades, despite employing non-traditional instruction for many weeks. Kindergarten Academy model that was implemented last school year proved a successful strategy to support Emergent Readers becoming Early Readers. 52% of current 1st grade students scored in the High Average/High range on Fall MAP Reading, an indication of sustained and additional growth. Most importantly, though, the results of perceptual survey showcase the strong commitment of staff and motivated community that has been cultivated among the staff here at Centerfield over the past few years. John Hattie's research shows that Collective Teacher Efficacy, the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students, has an effect size of 1.57 which is almost four times the impact on student achievement as other known strategies.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 Centerfield Data Review 2020		.