



SES 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_10162020_14:31

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Sebastian Elementary School
Jeremy Hall
90 LBJ Road
Jackson, Kentucky, 41339
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?

We have a Leadership Team that works on CSIP using data and school needs, meeting monthly and adjusting as needed. We have an Admin Team that meets weekly to discuss data review, and teacher/student needs. We have SBDM that reviews KPREP data yearly, Benchmark data quarterly, and Intervention Data monthly. Our grade level teams meet weekly to discuss formative and summative data, through our PLC process, which follows the PDSA model. Our entire staff works together to analyze KPREP scores, looking for patterns, successes and weaknesses. All meetings are documented through Agendas/notes on Google Drive.

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.

Proficient and Distinguished in Reading went from 46.9 in 2017-18 to 48.7 in 2018-2019. Our novice in reading during the same years resulted in a reduction from 28.1% to 25.1%. Proficient and Distinguished in Math went from 38.8% in 2017-18 to 42.2% in 2018-19. Our novice in math decreased from 22.2% to 21.1%. Novice in Science decreased from 17.1% in 2017-18 to 14.1% in 2018-19. Social Studies Novice decreased from 15.6% in 2017-18 to 4.8% in 2018-19. Prof/Dis in Social Studies increased from 47.8% to 61.9%. When looking at the growth rate for 18-19, the economically disadvantaged was 64.6% and non economically disadvantaged was 61.8% for math and reading combined. The economically disadvantaged population have a Novice in Reading of 31.3%, while non economically disadvantaged scored 3.3%. Behavior improved drastically from 18-19 (127 Behavior events) to 19-20 (51 Behavior events). The Novice rate for the economically disadvantaged for Math was 26.6% and non economically disadvantaged was 1.6%. According to the survey given to parents in the fall of 2019, on a scale of 1-5, parents rated "Teaching and Assessing for Learning" at 4.46. The Novice rate for disability was 25.4% for math students with IEP and 19.8% without IEP. The Novice rate for Science in the economically disadvantaged group was 21.3% and 0% for non economically disadvantaged group. The Novice rate for

writing for the disability group with an IEP was 53.5% compared to 27.1% for students without an IEP. Student attendance increased from 93.18 in 2018-19 to 93.47 in 2019-20. Map Data in comparison from 2019-2020 show 4th graders increased in math from 192.8 to 195.5, and in reading from 194.7 to 197.5. Map Data in comparison from 2019-2020 show 5th graders increased in math from 199.5 to 200.1 and in reading from 199.3 to 201.5. Map Data in comparison from 2019-2020 show 6th graders DEcreased in math from 216.9 to 212.4, and in reading from 214.9 to 212.0.

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.

Novice rate for the economically disadvantaged for Math was 26.6% and non economically disadvantaged was 1.6%. The novice rate for disability was 25.4% for math students with IEP and 19.8% without IEP. The Novice rate for Science in the economically disadvantaged group was 21.3% and 0% for non economically disadvantaged group. The novice rate for writing for the disability group with an IEP was 53.5% compared to 27.1% for students without an IEP. When looking at the growth rate for 18-19, the economically disadvantaged was 64.6% and non economically disadvantaged was 61.8% for math and reading combined. The economically disadvantaged population have a Novice in Reading of 31.3%, while non economically disadvantaged scored 3.3%. Based on 2019-20 Impact Survey, Teachers responded with 42% positive responses in Feedback and Coaching which ranks in 20-39th percentile statewide. That indicates we need to make improvements in those areas. The Novice rate for disability was 25.4% for math students with IEP and 19.8% without IEP. The Novice rate for Science in the economically disadvantaged group was 21.3% and 0% for non economically disadvantaged group. The Novice rate for writing for the disability group with an IEP was 53.5% compared to 27.1% for students without an IEP.

Trends

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

Decrease novice rates for the economically disadvantaged students in all areas.

Map Data in comparison from Winter 2019 to Fall 2020 show 6th graders decreased in math from 216.9 to 212.4, and in reading from 214.9 to 212.0.

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](#)

Our school will focus on KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction, KCWP4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data, and KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support. KCWP 2 will focus on increasing proficiency in math and reading by including analysis of curriculum resources in the PLC process using the PDSA model with an emphasis on Tier 1 instruction, formative and summative assessments, direct explicit instruction, and student goal setting. Walkthrough schedule will focus on the 4 District non-negotiables which are: grade appropriate assignments, deep engagement, strong instruction, and high expectations. KCWP 4 will focus on: analyzing data and developing coaching sessions for teachers, progress monitoring for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction, and the PLC process. KCWP 5 will focus on: GAP, polish MTSS process for movement between Tiers 1,2, & 3, use progress monitoring data to make adjustments for instruction, PLC process for Tiered instruction, Benchmarks will be given 3 times a year and data used to differentiate instruction.

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%.

Our Growth indicator scale score was considered in the high range. Our Growth rate for the disability group with an IEP was 83.4. Student attendance increased from 93.18 in 2018-19 to 93.47 in 2019-20. Social Studies Novice decreased from 15.6% in 2017-18 to 4.8% in 2018-19. Prof/Dis in Social Studies increased from 47.8% to 61.9%. Proficient and Distinguished in Reading went from 46.9 in 2017-18 to 48.7 in 2018-2019. Our novice in reading during the same years resulted in a reduction from 28.1% to 25.1%. Proficient and Distinguished in Math went from 38.8% in 2017-18 to 42.2% in 2018-19. Our novice in math decreased from 22.2% to 21.1%. Novice in Science decreased from 17.1% in 2017-18 to 14.1% in 2018-19. Behavior improved drastically from 18-19 (127 Behavior events) to 19-20 (51 Behavior events). According to the survey given to parents in the fall of 2019, on a scale of 1-5, parents rated all areas above 4 out of 5. Map Data in comparison from 2019-2020 show 4th graders increased in math from 192.8 to 195.5, and in reading from 194.7 to 197.5. Map Data in comparison from 2019-2020 show 5th graders increased in math from 199.5 to 200.1 and in reading from 199.3 to 201.5.

Attachment Summary

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