November 1, 2018 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10122018_08:30

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Ryland Heights Elementary School
Sara Callahan
3845 Stewart Rd
Ryland Heights, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/21/2018
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

eProve diagnostics

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?

School data is reviewed on a continuous basis. KPREP data is reviewed with all faculty members during an after school PD session and it is reviewed with SBDM council during the first monthly meeting once data is released. MAP data is also reviewed with SBDM Council during appropriate monthly meetings, and it is reviwed with teachers during weekly PLC's and specified RTI meetings three times a year. In addition to KPREP and MAP data, Brigance, iRead, Read 180, System 44, RTA and other small group intervention data is reviewed regularly through PLC's and during school MTSS meetings. Data regarding progress of special education students is reviewed weekly during special education PLC's.

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

eProve 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.

-- 61.45% of All Students scored proficient or distinguished on 17-18 KPREP Reading -- 25% of Students with Disabilities scored proficient or distinguished on 17-18 KPREP Reading -- 55.27 % of All Students Scored proficient or distinguished on 17-18 KPREP Math -- 21.15% of Students with Disabilities scored proficient or distinguished on 17-18 KPREP Math -- 27.55 % of All Students reached proficiency on the 17-18 Science KPREP test -- 68.93% of All Students reached proficiency on the 17-18 Social Studies KPREP Assessment

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.

--75% of students in the disability category fell below proficiency on the KPREP test in reading as opposed to 38.5% when looking at all students. --78.8% of students in the disability category fell below proficiency on the KPREP test in math as opposed to 44.79% when looking at all students. --75% of students in the disability category fell below proficiency on the KPREP writing on demand as opposed to 41.75% when looking at all students. --81.25% of students in the disability category fell below proficiency on the KPREP test in Social Studies as opposed to 31.07% when looking at all students. --72.45% of all students fell below proficiency on the KPREP test in Science with 96% of Students with Disabilities falling below proficiency on the KPREP Science test.

<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?

When looking at KPREP data from 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-2018, proficiency for students with disabilities has continued to be an area for improvement. Ryland Heights Elementary has been determined a TSI school in the area of Students with Disabilities, based on 17-18 KPREP scores. Similarly, in 15-16 there was a significant discrepancy in reading proficiency when comparing All Students (66.9% proficiency) to Students with Disabilities (17.4% proficiency). In 16/17 that discrepancy continued with All Students at 60% reading proficiency and Students with Disabilities at only 18% reading proficiency. That discrepancy is also evident in KPREP Math Proficiency with 15-16 scores indicating 56.8% math proficiency for All Students and only 13% math proficiency for Students with Disabilities. 16-17 KPREP Math Proficiency Scores showed 50.5% of All Students reaching math proficiency while only 12% of Students with Disabilities scored in the proficient range.

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](#)

-- All teachers follow the district timeline or a SBDM approved adjustment of that timeline to ensure all standards are covered for all students. Pacing is monitored weekly through PLC discussions, lesson plan checks and learning walks. -- Weekly PLC discussions, review of lesson plans and learning walks are used to determine that instruction delivered meets the intent of adopted standards. --- School staff receive ongoing professional development regarding the cycle of quality instruction. Areas addressed during training sessions include 1) Ensuring students are exposed to appropriate, standards based tasks/text/problems 2) Substantive interaction occurs for all students and yield a product that provides information enabling teachers to adapt instruction 3) Effective methods of collaborations that enable students to process their thinking and provide teachers with insight into needed instructional adjustments. ---Teachers and school leaders utilize MAP assessment data to assist in determination of student needs as well as areas of improvement for Tier 1 instruction. ---Students are given regular assessments focused on recent standards to determine instructional needs such as reteaching, flash backs, wrong answer analysis and other methods for standard clarification based on assessment data. --PLC's focus on data as well as intentional instructional strategies to improve student achievement and meet individual student needs.

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%.

--18.9% of All 3rd grade students scored novice on the reading KPREP in 17/18 which was down from 31% novice in 3rd grade reading on 16/17 KPREP -- KPREP Reading Proficiency for All 3rd Grade Students increased to 58% in 17/18 from 49% in 16/17 -- 56.4% of all 4th Grade Students reached proficiency in reading on 16/17 KPREP while that class of students scored 72.8% proficiency in reading as 5th grade students on the 17/18 KPREP assessment -- Math scores from the 17/18 KPREP indicates that 59.46% of All 3rd Grade Students reached proficiency. This was an increase from 40% of All 3rd Grade Students who reached math proficiency on the 16/17 KPREP assessment. -- 47.5% of all 4th Grade Students reached proficiency in math on 16/17 KPREP while that class of students scored 63.11% proficiency in math as 5th grade students on the 17/18 KPREP assessment

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

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

eProve diagnostics

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY

Attachment Name	Description	Item(s)

eProve diagnostics