

## 2019-20 Heritage Elementary The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**Heritage Elementary**  
Johnna Black  
8300 Frankfort Rd  
Waddy, Kentucky, 40076  
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/27/2019  
Status: Locked

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools .....	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment .....	4
Protocol .....	5
Current State .....	6
Priorities/Concerns .....	7
Trends .....	8
Potential Source of Problem.....	9
Strengths/Leverages .....	10
Attachment Summary .....	11

## 2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

### 2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

---

## Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

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 (e.g. 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 (i.e. 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. 703 KAR 2:225 requires, as part of continuous improvement planning for schools, each school complete the needs assessment between October 1 and November 1 of each year and include: (1) a description of the data reviewed and the process used to develop the needs assessment; (2) a review of the previous plan and its implementation to inform development of the new plan; and, (3) perception data gathered from the administration of a valid and reliable measure of teaching and learning conditions. Further, as required by Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools implementing a schoolwide program must base their Title I program on a comprehensive 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?

SBDM Council Members include J.J. Black, Megan Baxter, Taylor Shaver, Allie Peavler, Amy Casey, and Loretta Devine. The instructional leadership team includes J.J. Black, Jarrod Slone, Amanda Davenport, and Kara Clark. Instructional planning meetings happen daily. Data teams are weekly with an alternating emphasis on reading and math. RTI and SBDM Council meetings are monthly. The meetings are documented through a variety of ways including but not limited to agendas, notes, and rubrics of student data.

## 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:

- Thirty-four (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (54%) of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 57%.

### Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

Per KPREP, our overall achievement score dropped from 70.6 in 2018 to 65.5 in 2019. Our proficiency indicator increased from 70.6 in 2018 to 71.7 in 2019. Our separate academic indicator increased from 63.3 in 2018 to 66.8 in 2019. Our growth indicator increased from 17.1 in 2018 to 58.2 in 2019. At this time there is not any data for GAP area.

## Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

**NOTE:** These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

**Example:** Sixty-eight (68%) of students in the achievement gap scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

Areas of weakness as determined by KPREP results: Reading achievement scores dropped from 55.3% P/D in 2018 to 50.6% P/D in 2019. Science achievement scores dropped from 22.5% P/D in 2018 to 22.4% PD in 2019.

---

## Trends

Analyzing data trends from the previous two academic years, which academic, cultural and behavioral measures remain significant areas for improvement?

Reading achievement scores dropped from 57% P/D in 2017 to 55.3% P/D in 2018 to 50.6% P/D in 2019. Math achievement scores dropped from 62% P/D in 2017 to 47.6% P/D in 2018 then increased to 51.4% P/D in 2019. Writing achievement scores dropped from 41% P/D in 2017 to 40.5% P/D in 2018 then increased to 53.3% P/D in 2019. Social Studies achievement scores dropped from 48% P/D in 2017 to 41.7% P/D in 2018 then increased to 60% P/D in 2019.



---

## 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 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data Our school will focus its resources and efforts on improving instructional practices. We will analyze student data on daily, weekly, and monthly basis to determine the effectiveness of instructional practices. Coaching conversations by our instructional coach and our principal will happen at least weekly to provide instructional feedback to move students toward their growth goals.

## Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school.

**Example:** Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

Per KPREP Data: Social Studies proficiency scores increased from 41.7% P/D in 2018 to 60% P/D in 2019. Math achievement scores increased from 47.6% P/D in 2018 to 51.4% P/D in 2019. Writing achievement scores increased from 40.5% P/D in 2018 to 53.3% P/D in 2019.

---

## Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------