

**Nov. 1, 2018Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools\_10202018\_12:37**

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**James A Caywood Elementary School**

Kelly Conner  
3300 Turkeyfoot Rd  
Edgewood, Kentucky, 41017  
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/20/2018

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?

Initial overall KPREP data and new accountability model was reviewed at PLC meetings in early October. Next, the school wide data analysis took place after school on October 18, 2018 for 3 hours of professional development. Stakeholders involved included preschool through 5th grade teachers, special education teachers, EL instructional assistant, Title interventionist as well as special area teachers. At this meeting, each grade level was required to complete an Action Plan based on critical data points triangulating KRPEP data, MAP Scores, Dibels and other intervention data. Each action plan was reviewed by the Administrative team on Oct. 22nd. The KPREP data was reviewed by the SBDM Council on October 24, 2018. Following that meeting, the School Leadership Team comprised of representatives from all grade levels, special education, and special area teachers reviewed and made adjustments to the action plans on October 26, 2018. The school leadership team will continue to meet at minimum twice monthly to review CSIP goals and plans based on triangulated data.

### **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.
- Top 18% in the state for growth -59.09% of third grade students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading as compared to 67% of students in the previous school year. -46.91% of 4th grade students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading -Last year's 4th grade students improved from 48.6% in Reading to 59.59% in Reading as 5th graders in 2017-18 KPREP scores -52.54% of GAP students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Math as compared to 60.42% of ALL students.
- 21.21% of 5th grade students scored Distinguished in On-Demand Writing as compared to GAP students at 17.39%

## **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.

-In 2017-18, there were 249 behavior referrals with 30 out of school suspension days -67% of third graders scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading in the 16-17 school year. In 2017-18 those same students as 4th graders scored 53.85% proficient or distinguished showing a 13.15% drop in scores. -65% of third graders in 16-17 scored Proficient or Distinguished in Math. The same students in 4th grade scored 54.81% in Math showing a 10.19% drop in Math. Both of these declines in scores occur from 3rd to 4th grade.

### **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?

-Reading remains a significant area of improvement across grade levels and GAP groups, particularly from 3rd to 4th grade. -Math remains an area for growth particularly from 3rd to 4th grade as well. -The number of behavior referrals and out of school suspensions for major behaviors remains an area of improvement.

### **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 KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data

### **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%.

-Scoring in the top 18% of elementary schools in the state for growth. -GAP students in math score within 10% of ALL students. All GAP kids in Math score above district average.

### **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)
-----------------	-------------	---------