Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools 2018-19

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Rich Pond Elementary
Dan Costellow
530 Rich Pond Road
Bowling Green, Kentucky, 42104
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/26/2018
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment 3
Protocol 4
Current State 5
Priorities/Concerns 6
Trends 7
Potential Source of Problem 8
Strengths/Leverages 9
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY 10

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?

Regarding state assessment data, because it is embargoed, that information is initially collected and analyzed by the leadership team. This year we began processing it and discussing it right away. As soon as we could we shared it with staff and spent a significant amount of time looking at school-wide, grade level, and individual results. Student reports are shared with students and parents and goals for improvement are set. Most importantly we use data teams to review STAR data immediately after each school-wide testing window. Grade level teams meet with leadership and interventionists to adjust strategies and determine Tier placement of students. SBDM meets bi-monthly and data is shared with council members on a timely basis.

ATTACHMENTS

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

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.

We have high achievement in reading and math, but we are underperforming in writing. See attachments.

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.

We have great teacher and student attendance, and low discipline issues. Aside from minor or isolated situations, there are few, if any non-academic issues which negatively impact achievement. Our biggest concern is writing. From 2017 to 2018 on the K-PREP we declined from 55.8% to 38.8% Proficient & Distinguished. Although we placed an emphasis on it, our scores declined. This year we plan to be more intentional with strategies and follow-through, as well as putting some school-wide expectations and procedures in place. Our writing committee is going to be more intentional in devising strategies to improve instructional quality and consistency. While we hope to see some immediate return on investment, we know that time spent in the primary will lead to success down the road on state assessments and for overall student achievement. Less of a concern, but something we are spending some time on, is improving and aligning our math instruction. 87% of our students scored above the 40th percentile on the August 2018 district-wide window of the STAR assessment (the next closest school was 79% with the district average being 67%). We are utilizing district specialists to work with all teachers to add more strategies to their toolbox, to ensure consistency from grade to grade, and to utilize tools in math that will contribute to writing (number talks, for example).

ATTACHMENTS

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

Trends

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

As previously stated, there are few, if any cultural, behavioral, or other non-academic concerns. We will maintain high reading and math performance while being more intentional in our approach to writing.

ATTACHMENTS

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

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction

ATTACHMENTS

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

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%.

We have strong reading and math scores. See attachments.

ATTACHMENTS

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

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY

Attachment Name	Description	Item(s)
COMPARISON OF 2018 VS 2017 k-prep	Rich Pond 2017 & 2018 K-PREP Data	, ,
Compiled STAR Data 18-19 (as of October 2018)	District wide historical STAR data.	, ,