Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10012018_17:55

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Goshen At Hillcrest Elementary School
Lisa Peters
12518 Ridgemoor Drive
Prospect, Kentucky, 40059
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/10/2018
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 grade levels will review data using a pre-determined protocol and results shared with stakeholders, as an informational piece, and with teachers to drive their instructional practices. Each grade level analyzes scores during extended planning to allow multiple teachers to add to the discussion about best practice. The classroom teachers will analyze results from students they had in the testing year, to look for trends and patterns of student learning and instructional practices. The teachers will then analyze data information for their current students to determine if strategies showing positive trends will work for their current students. The Intervention Team and Instructional Team will review results with the grade level teams and use the information to form intervention groups (Tier II and Tier III) for all students. Our SBDM Council will review the results and offer any additional thoughts for each team. Grade Level Teams and Instructional Team meet weekly to address concerns that arise. Our Intervention Team will meet as needed to formulate flexible groups for student support. All meetings follow a protocol and complete meeting notes as an accountability measure.

ATTACHMENTS

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

e|Prove 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.

Information obtained from our 1718 scores indicate our NAPD score, when compared to the old model, demonstrates Reading moving from 95%-97.8%, math 95.8%-97.4%, SS 95.2%-100% and Writing 98.9% to 91.1%. Since the state has developed a new scoring means, our baseline scores for NAPD are Reading 92.8%, math 92.5%, Science 98.7%, SS 87.1% and writing 88.3%. Within the new model, our proficiency score is 92.7, Separate Academic Indicator (Science, Social Studies, Writing) 84.7 and Growth 22.1. 75.4% Scored P/D in Reading down from 77.4% and above the state average of 54.3%. 3rd grade in reading moved from 80.2 to 87, 4th grade moved from 71 to 76.5 and 5th grade dropped from 79.7 to 71. Math P/D remained the same as the previous year 74.9% and above the state average of 49.1%. 3rd grade in math moved from 74 to 80.3, 4th grade dropped from 73.5 to 70 and 5th grade dropped 76.1 to 75.7. Social Studies, based on percentage of Proficient and Distinguished, dropped from 84.2 to 75.7 but above the state average of 60. Writing based on percentage of Proficient and Distinguished dropped from 82.7 to 71.8. Growth in Reading and Math indicates that 73% of students are Keeping Up in the area of Reading with 17% Less than Catch Up. In Math, 70% of students are Keeping Up with 28% Less than Catch Up. Our total Growth Indicator Score was 22.1. Nonacademic Current state at Goshen shows our student attendance rate at 97.2% with teacher attendance at 94.8%. Significant Behavior Events total 6 events.

ATTACHMENTS

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

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.

Our percentage of Novice Readers show a positive trend in 3rd grade, moving from 10 to 6%. 4th grade was not a significant change and remains at 7% novice, and 5th grade showed a negative trend moving from 7% to 13.6% novice. Our Gap Groups for Hispanic and EL improved in the area of Reading. EL moved from 45.7% gap to 20.9% gap. Hispanic moved from 28.4% to a 20.6% Gap. Our Disabled students in reading dropped from 39.7% to 45.8%, which clearly demonstrates an area of concern. Our percentage of Novice Learners in Math showed a positive trend in 3rd grade, moving from 6% to 3% novice. 4th grade had a negative trend moving from 5% to 10% novice and 5th grade also had a negative trend from 6% to 10% novice. Our Gap groups for Hispanic increased from 36% to 38.7% novice. However, our EL Gap group went from 56 % to 20.4% novice. This concern would be our Hispanic student in the area of Math. Disabled students in math closed the gap from 54.1% to 42.2, which signifies a decrease in our Disabled Gap for Math. Our largest concern would be our Gap Groups in Writing. The Disabled students increased from 30.5% to 65.5% and our Poverty Gap Group from 13.8% to 19.4% gap.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>
Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

eProve diagnostics

Trends

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

Gap Groups continue to be a concern for Goshen and an area for improvement especially with the Disabled Students in Reading and Writing. The trend shown in grade levels of scores that are stagnant is another area to watch and research for instructional practices that will move all students.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

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

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](#)

To produce the desired change, Goshen will continue to focus on flexible grouping across all content to better serve our struggling student and provide extensions in learning for our achieving students. The development and use of common formative assessments will help to narrow the skill needed for student mastery. Data analysis will continue on a regular basis by our classroom teachers and ESS to strengthen our instruction in Tier I and narrow down groups for our ESS teachers.

ATTACHMENTS

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

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%.

Our strengths is our overall scores based from the three areas of Proficiency, Separate Academic Indicator and Growth. Goshen maintains solid scores in reading and math, which provides significant percentages from students that serve as role models for our Gap Groups. Focusing on Tier I instruction may be a significant piece to support movement of students into proficiency and distinguished categories.

<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)