2020-21 Phase Two Needs Assessment

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Locust Grove Elementary School
Austin Collins
1231 E Highway 22
Crestwood, Kentucky, 40014
United States of America

Table of Contents

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 process for which data is reviewed and analyzed at Locust Grove is deeply rooted in the PLC process. PLC's exist in multiple levels in our building and engage a wide array of stakeholders at various stages of the process. Building-wide data is reviewed at different stages throughout the year as it becomes available. These data include KPREP, CogAt, MAP and DRA data. The building level leadership team works together to disaggregate and analyze comparative results from previous reporting periods and progress among our GAP populations as well as our general populations. The most important task we have is to objectively identify longitudinal data trends (typically 3 years or more) to analyze curricular strengths and deficits. The principal then facilitates a variety of structured conversations with PLC team leaders, PTO, and other relevant stakeholders. Thereafter, a structured goal setting conversation is facilitated outlining overall goals and specific, measurable benchmarks that communicate our progress towards those goals.Localized data are analyzed weekly at each grade level. Tools we utilize for these include Summative and Common Formative assessments, Running Record Data, Anecdotal evidence and grade level rubrics aligned to standards. During this analysis, Principals and coaches are always involved and support teams in identifying student learning needs and targeting next steps instructionally. Evidence for all of these conversations and dialogue can be found on our PLC team drives in Google as well as our Lion Learning community agendas.

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.

Based on 18-19 K-PREP Assessment Results, we see that Reading Proficiency is 63.3% a .5% increase. Reading Proficiency for Learners with Disabilities is 32% a 2% reduction. Reading Proficiency among students of Poverty is 53.2% a 13.6 increase. Math Proficiency is 61% a 1 percent decrease. Math Proficiency for Learners with Disabilities is 26% an 8% increase. Math Proficiency among students of Poverty is 49.5% a 10.9% increase.

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.

Based on our 18-19 K-PREP Assessment Data, students with disabilities are our priority as current gap is at 40% in the area of mathematics and 35.7% in the area of reading. Currently, students with disabilities are performing at 32% proficiency. In Math, we are slightly worse, at 26% proficiency. Last year we were identified as a TSI school. While the designation has been lifted, the fact remains that our most significant area for growth is with our learners with disabilities.

Trends

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

Reading scores are generally flat-lined, hovering around 65% proficiency. While overall reading appears to be flat, our 3rd and 5th grade levels made significant growth of more than 5% last year. Our 4th grade student population decreased compared to the previous year's cohort, but the student population actually increased proficiency by 8.5%. Math scores are also flat-lined in the low 60's. Trends suggest that our specific difficulty lies within our 3rd grade students, scoring at the 55th percentile or lower the past 3 years.

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](#)

The primary problem of practice at Locust Grove is our difficulty in understanding and adequately assessing student learning outcomes. We have undergone extensive professional development to help understand the most efficient ways to assess students and utilize data to drive instruction. Currently, teams are working through the PLC process and determining power standards, standards based assessments and working through the instructional cycle. Furthermore, specific to reading we have uncovered a knowledge and skill gap in our intermediate teaching population regarding their ability to adequately assess and intervene on behalf of students needing additional reading instruction. That is, students that are unable to read by the 3rd grade do not have access to high quality reading interventions and support that will address the root issue of the problem. The intermediate teachers at Locust Grove will benefit from additional support in the area of foundational reading strategies so they can adequately assess and intervene for their students that are learning to read.

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 18-19 K-PREP data, writing proficiency has steadily increased over the last 4 years. In 2015-16 44.7% of our students were proficient in writing, currently 63.6% of our students are proficient or distinguished in the area of writing.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)