

## **CCE The Needs Assessment for Schools 2018-19**

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**Clear Creek Elementary**  
Kim Willhoite  
279 Chapel Hill Rd  
Shelbyville, Kentucky, 40065  
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/31/2019  
Status: Locked

---

## 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?

Data is analyzed regularly throughout the year. We have state data (KPREP), district data (MAP, DRA, AMC, PAST), and school data (weekly formative assessments). Each of these are analyzed slightly different and, at times, with different groups of people. State level data: This data is analyzed with all certified staff within the school annually in October. We, as a certified staff, look at the data and ask school-level questions about the data that we would like answered. Then, as a staff, we dig into the data to answer the questions we have asked. We have asked questions such as: Where does the data indicate our students are struggling the most? Is this a trend we are seeing in all grade levels or just in one? Is it a consistent gap from year to year or just 1 year? Once the data is analyzed and the questions are answered, we look at the action steps that are required to address the concerns we see. District level data: The district level data is analyzed 3 times a year: fall, winter, and spring. The data is analyzed within the school leadership team at the school level and shared with all certified staff in a weekly learning workshop meeting (faculty meeting). The data is then further analyzed by each teacher and grade level team. School level data: Every week teachers formatively assess their students in various content areas. Once a week, each grade level team brings a common formative assessment to our data team meeting. The team, along with leadership staff, analyze the data to identify student strengths, misconceptions, and instructional next steps.

### **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.

43.2% of students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Reading. 29.2% of students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Math. 34% of non-duplicated gap students scored proficient or distinguished in reading from 2017-2018. 18% of non-duplicated gap students scored proficient or distinguished in math from 2017-2018. 36% of students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP writing. 93% of our students have attended the monthly behavior rewards based on day to day behavior.

## **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 seen an increase in all gap groups of students scoring in the novice area from 2017 to 2018 on the KPREP assessment. 38.5% of students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to last years 66%. 36% of students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in math as opposed to last years 81%. All gap groups (Hispanic, English Language Plus Monitored, Students with IEPs, and Free and Reduced Lunch) underperformed compared to their peers in all academic areas (reading, math, science, social studies, and writing).

### **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?

Over the course of the last two years we have seen a significant decrease in the percent of students scoring at the proficient level in math. We have seen this trend over the course of multiple data sources: KPREP and MAP. We have also seen a decrease in the percent of students scoring at the proficient level in reading. Again, we have seen this trend over the course of multiple data sources: KPREP and MAP.

### **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](#)

2-Delivery of Instruction: The teachers in our school are aware of the KCAS as they have been fully implemented for years. We use workshop model as the mode of instructional delivery. However, we continue to focus our instruction and work on improving our intentionality of learning targets, strategy usage, and responsiveness to student learning. 3-Assessment Literacy: As a staff, we are continuing to grow in our development and design of high quality, rigorous assessments. Our teachers use assessments regularly (formally and informally) but we are continuing to work on the design of the assessments. 4-Data Analysis: As a staff, we analyze common formative assessments weekly in a formal data team structure to discuss student progress, next steps, and reflect on 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%.

The four gap groups that were reported in the KPREP data set (Free and Reduced Lunch, Hispanic, Students with IEPs, and English Language Plus Monitored) had high growth. Free and Reduced Lunch: 19 Hispanic: 19.8 Students with IEPs: 18.4 English Language Plus Monitored: 21

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