

2018-2019 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10142018_22:21

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Yellow Creek School Center

Barbara Warren
4840 W Cumberland Ave
Middlesboro, Kentucky, 40965
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2018

Last Modified: 12/02/2018

Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment 3

Protocol 4

Current State 6

Priorities/Concerns 7

Trends 8

Potential Source of Problem..... 9

Strengths/Leverages 10

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY..... 11

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?

Christel Hoskins- Assistant Principal Lea Fultz- Primary Teacher Hope Carroll- Primary Teacher Tasha Barnett-Intermediate Teacher Eva Brock-Middle Teacher Theresa Napier-Special Education Teacher Nikki Damron-Parent Jamie Johnson-School Guidance Counselor Nacole Middleton-Attendance Clerk The CSIP Planning Team consists of 5 certified teachers, 1 parent, 1 classified staff and 2 administrators. Stakeholders were selected based on a variety of reasons. First, one teacher from each grade band was selected (K-1, 2-3, 4-6, 7-8) and a special education teacher in order to provide each hallway with a voice on the planning team. This year, we also added our School Guidance Counselor and our Attendance Clerk to give added opinion on behavior and attendance. Second, one of the teachers is a current SBDM member and two are former SBDM members, which provide our planning team with information on current school policies as well as other school issues. Third, our members are both veterans and new teachers. This was intended to provide both experience from veteran teachers and fresh ideas from our new teacher. Finally, our parent enjoys volunteering at our school and has SBDM experience. She is very positive and comfortable making suggestions to our team. The assistant principal also serves on the team as the chair. The planning team has a regularly set monthly meeting. Special called meetings are also held on an as-needed basis. There is a standing agenda item on each monthly SBDM agenda for review, updates and approval of the CSIP. This will allow for monthly progress monitoring. Meetings are documented through agendas, sign-in sheets and through the minutes of the SBDM meetings. The CSIP Planning Team meetings dates are also listed in the weekly Sunday email as to allow all staff members the opportunity to attend and provide input at any meeting. Data is collected, reviewed and analyzed in various ways. Teachers collect, review and analyze data from MAP, K-PREP and classroom assessments. Administrators meet with teachers to discuss these pieces of data as well as for the school overall. This is displayed in the Conference Room and is accessed during PLC meetings. Administrators also gather and analyze the data through EXCEL spreadsheets for the school overall as well as individual classrooms. This data is used to determine trends across content areas, grade levels and types of assessments. Administrators have regular meetings with District and Elgin Coach to assist in feedback on the data analysis to determine instructional decisions for the school. The CSIP Planning Team consists of 5 certified teachers, 1 parent, 1 classified staff and 2 administrators. Stakeholders were selected based on a variety of reasons. First, one teacher from each grade band was selected (K-1, 2-3, 4-6, 7-8) and a special education teacher in order to provide each hallway with a voice on the planning team. This year, we also added our School Guidance Counselor and our Attendance Clerk to give added opinion on behavior and attendance. Second, one of the teachers is a current SBDM member and two are former SBDM members, which provides our planning team with information on current school policies as well as other school issues. Third, our members are both veterans and new teachers. This was intended to provide both experience from veteran teachers and fresh ideas from our new teacher. Finally, our parent enjoys volunteering at our school and has SBDM experience. She is very positive and comfortable making suggestions to our team. The assistant principal also serves on the team as the chair. The planning team has a regularly set monthly meeting. Special called meetings are also held on an as-needed basis. There is a standing agenda item on each monthly SBDM agenda for review, updates and approval of the CSIP. This will allow for monthly progress monitoring. Meetings are documented through agendas, sign-in sheets and through the minutes of the SBDM meetings. The CSIP Planning Team meetings dates are also listed in the weekly Sunday email as to allow all staff members the opportunity to attend and provide input at any meeting. Data is collected, reviewed and analyzed in various ways. Teachers collect, review and analyze data from MAP, K-PREP and classroom assessments. Administrators

meet with teachers to discuss these pieces of data as well as for the school overall. This is displayed in the Conference Room and is accessed during PLC meetings. Administrators also gather and analyze the data through EXCEL spreadsheets for the school overall as well as individual classrooms. This data is used to determine trends across content areas, grade levels and types of assessments. Administrators have regular meetings with District and Elgin Coach to assist in feedback on the data analysis to determine instructional decisions for the school. In addition, each year, the school participates in "Data Day," which consists of two non-instructional workdays devoted entirely to reviewing, analyzing and applying the data results. Teachers meet in grade level and content area teams to analyze data in multiple ways and culminates in determining celebration of positive points and development of teacher and school action plans to address any concerns that arise as a result of the data analysis. Various outside visitors (PowerTeaching Math, SFA Reading, District Personnel) observe classrooms and provide feedback to teachers based on classroom observational data as well as coaching plans that are developed with classroom data in mind. Data is also collected in various ways in addition to the regular classroom. SFA Reading teachers input reading data into Member Center and this data is used to re-group reading students every 9 weeks. Math teachers submit chapter assessment data to the assistant principal and this data is used in district math leadership team meetings to make district decisions based on teacher and school need. This year, we have also added a supplemental program, Simple Solutions, to our Rtl block. This was provided by private grant funds, which also requires that data be maintained and analyzed to determine if the grant is successful and if it will be re-funded. Data is documented in various ways including: CSIP Planning Team meeting agendas, sign-in sheets, PLCs, data walls in the conference room, school calendar-Data Days, and SBDM meeting minutes.

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.

Current Academic State: MAP Data: -Each content area decreased overall from Spring 16/17 to Spring 17/18 -Reading-Six grade levels were above the 50th Percentile in Spring 17/18 -Math-Five grade levels improved from Fall to Spring in 17/18 -Language-6 out of 7 grade levels were above grade level in spring 17/18 K-PREP Data: -Reading & Math both increased in Proficient/Distinguished at Elementary & Middle levels -Writing percent of Proficient/Distinguished was above 50% at Elementary & Middle levels -Social Studies increased in percent of Proficient/Distinguished at Middle level -All content areas, except Social Studies, were below 20% Novice at Elementary level -All content areas were below 20% Novice at Middle level Current Non-Academic State: Behavior: -Incidents(Events) increased from 147 events in 16/17 to 205 events in 17/18 -Number of students involved in behavior-related incidents (events) increased from 68 students in 16/17 to 104 students in 17/18 Student Attendance: Teacher Attendance: Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage: Students With Disabilities:

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.

MAP Data: Reading-58% of students scored on grade level on MAP Reading in 16/17; 0% change from Spring 16 to Spring 17; 57% of students scored on grade level on MAP Reading in 17/18; 1% decrease from Spring 17 to Spring 18 after no change the previous two years. Reading-Only 3 out of 9 grade levels (2nd, 3rd, 5th) were all below 50% of students on grade level. Reading-Only 3 grade levels (1st, 6th and 8th) had more than a 2% increase, remaining grade levels had 1 point gain (3rd, 7th), no change (4th, 5th) or a loss (Kindergarten, 2nd grade). Math-40% of students on grade level on MAP Math in 17/18; a 2% decrease from Fall 17 to Spring 18; 12% decrease from 16/17. Math-8 out of 9 grade levels (except 6th grade) were ALL below 50% of students on grade level. Math-3 grade levels had 10% or more decrease (2nd-12%, 3rd-10%, 5th-14%) in percent of students on grade level. Language-58% of students on grade level on MAP Language in 17/18; 1% decrease from Fall 17 to Spring 18; 5% decrease from 16/17. Science-59% of students on grade level on MAP Science in 17/18; 4% decrease from Fall 17 to Spring 18; No change from 16/17 to 17/18. MAP OVERALL-Decrease overall in % of students on grade level in every content area (Reading, Math, Language), except Science, which had no change from 16/17 to 17/18. K-PREP Data: High Percentage of students scoring Apprentice remains in all content areas in all grade levels. Reading-Increase in students scoring Novice at Middle level. Math-Below 50% of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished in Math at Elementary & Middle levels. Social Studies-Students scoring Proficient/Distinguished decreased by 26% at Elementary level. Science-Low percent of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished at Elementary & Middle levels.

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?

Academic Trends: -Scores overall have plateaued and many are not meeting expectations -High percentage of students scoring Apprentice over several years in all content areas -More than 10% of students scoring Novice in all areas and at all grade levels except Elementary Writing -Low percent of students scoring Proficient/Distinguished on K-PREP in math Non-Academic Trends: Attendance-High percentage of students that are either absent or considered chronically absent Behavior-Increase in number of behavior incidents/events and number of students with behavior incidents

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 2: Design and Deliver Instruction: -Ensure their instructional program is intentional and of the highest quality. Tier I should be highly effective, culturally responsive, evidence-based core instruction, provided to all students in the classroom. Implementation of evidence-based curriculum and/or strategies with fidelity is essential for both academic and behavioral instruction. Improve RtI process and classroom assessment data analysis through PLCs. Process: -Develop a clearly defined RTI school/districtwide process with applicable checklist(s) and documentation tools, including such information as service frequency, intervention programs/strategies, SMART goal measurement, and progress monitoring checks. -Implement formal and informal processes that teachers and students utilize to gather evidence to directly improve the learning of students assessed. Practice: -Develop assignments and activities reflect the learning targets students have had the opportunity to learn. Condition: -Ensure that all users of assessment data use information to benefit student learning. KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy: -Improve student achievement Process: -Implement formal and informal processes that teachers and students utilize to gather evidence to directly improve the learning of students assessed. Practice: -Use classroom assessments to inform teacher's instructional decisions. -Evaluate the quality of test items, test tasks, and scoring rubrics. Condition: -Ensure that all users of assessment data use information to benefit student learning.

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%.

Academic Strengths: K-PREP-Elementary and Middle levels achieved “Other” status K-PREP-Elementary Grades Reading-54.3% scored Proficient/Distinguished (state average-54.6%) K-PREP-Middle Grades Reading -65.4% scored Proficient/Distinguished (state average-60.0%) K-PREP Middle Grades Math-44.9% scored Proficient/Distinguished (state average-47.0%) K-PREP-Writing On-Demand-6.1% Novice (Elem); and 69.7% scored Proficient/Distinguished (state average-40.5%) Middle-51.0% scored Proficient/Distinguished (state average-44.3%) MAP Data: Overall in K-8, Reading increased by 6% from Fall 17 to Spring 18 on MAP. Non-Academic Strengths: Student attendance increased by High percentage of students participate in after school activities with success at both the local and state level.

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)
-----------------	-------------	---------