

**November 1 2018- Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_10122018_09:19**

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Piner Elementary School
Christi Jefferds
2845 Piner Ridge Rd
Morning View, Kentucky, 41063
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/25/2018
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?

At Piner each year, our administrators host a school-wide KPREP Data Analysis PD. It includes all teachers and staff, and the FRC Coordinator,. Additionally, our Piner SBDM Council members are invited to attend. We use the KASC Score and Gap Analyzer Tool kit, and identify areas of strength and need. From this, we develop school wide goals for our CSIP. Additionally, data is reviewed throughout the year in a variety of settings. Teachers, both general and special education, meet weekly in PLCs with the school administrators, and review MAP data following each administration of the test. Additional data analysis is completed in PLCs throughout the year using weekly assessment and common assessment data. Our RTI team (including administrators, classroom teachers, interventionists, and special education teachers) meets in PLCs to review RTI data for academic areas and behavior. Recommendations are made during these meetings regarding the progress or lack of progress of the interventions implemented. Student Assistance Team meetings are held to provide support and make a plan for next steps when students are in intensive interventions and there are still concerns of lack of growth. Each student's data is reviewed at least every six weeks; at times, the SAT members may refer students for a special education referral.

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.
- KPREP Reading, 12.6% of students scored novice and 67.7% scored P/D -Reading P/D increased 2% and novice decreased 2.1% from 2017 -KPREP Math, 8.7% of students scored novice and 65% of students scored P/D -Math P/D increased 2.2% but novice increased from 2017
- KPREP Science, 12.1% of students scored novice and 39.6% of students scored P/D -KPREP Social Studies, 7.04% of students scored novice and 76.06% of students scored P/D -KPREP Writing, 12.68% of students scored novice and 46.48% of students scored P/D -Writing Gap, 21.43% Novice and 30.95% P/D -GAP students had higher percentages of novice and lower percentages of P/D in all areas on KPREP -Above the state average in: proficiency 83.8% (state 70.5%), separate academic area 74.1% (state 64.8), and growth 17.6% (state 17.1%) -Females outperforming males in all areas with P/D on KPREP other than science -Special Education subgroup below the state TSI cut score of 60.5 on KPREP

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.

-KPREP Writing, the number of students scoring P/D decreased from 61.9% in 2017 to 46.48% in 2018. This is a 15.4% decrease in P/D. -KPREP Writing, the number of students scoring novice doubled from 6.3% in 2017 to 12.7% in 2018 -Special Education subgroup below the state TSI cut score of 60.5 on KPREP -Science was the lowest separate academic indicator area with 36.3% of students scoring P/D

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?

-Writing remains a significant area for improvement, as scores for all students have decreased over the last 4 years. -The number of special education students scoring novice in math has increased from 25% to 34.2% and the number of P/D has decreased. -In Reading, the number of males scoring P/D (60.7%) is significantly lower than females scoring P/D (79%) -Our free and reduced students are scoring consistently lower than our overall scores by double digits in all areas.

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 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results. We will continue to refine our weekly assessment implementation and data analysis in reading and math. Teachers will assess one standard at a time following instruction. Teacher will develop instructional plans to remediate students who fail to master the standards, as well as providing extension/enrichment to students who have. Weekly assessments will be reviewed prior to administration by the PLC for standard alignment and appropriate level of rigor; results will be reviewed weekly in PLCs. Teachers will provide their remediation plans at that time, but for students failing to master the standards, or to reteach all students standards that were not mastered.

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%.

-KPREP Social Studies, 7.04% of students scored novice and 76.06% of students scored P/D -
KPREP Reading, 12.6% of students scored novice (a 2.1% decrease) and 67.7% scored P/D (a
2% increased) from 2017 -KPREP Math, 65% of students scored P/D which is an increased of
2.2%

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