

2019-20 Wright Elementary Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09252019_13:33

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Wright Elementary
Seth Green
500 Rocket Ln
Shelbyville, Kentucky, 40065
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/12/2019
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?

Wright Elementary staff teachers, Sight Based Council Representatives and staff members review and analyze KRPEP and MAP assessments monthly at our Sight Based Decision Council Meetings (minutes). Staff will evaluate and analyze MAP assessments which occur three times a year in the Fall, Winter, and Spring. Staff also evaluates DRA Assessments and On-Demand Writing assessments at least once a month. Staff will analyze the data of students and hold a data team (weekly) on student performance and strategically plan with grade-level team members to address strengths and weaknesses in academic achievement.

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.

Academic Current State: 17.6% of students with disabilities scored a distinguished or proficient on KPREP Reading 20% of EL scored distinguished or proficient 38.8% of all students scored proficient or distinguished in reading compared to the state average of 54.6% 35.8% of students scored proficient or distinguished in math compared to the state average of 48.6% 9.6% of students scored proficient in science compared to the state average of 31.7% 42.9 % of students scored proficient in KPREP Social Studies Non-Academic Current State: Behavior Referrals decreased from 29/month to 11/month 98% of parents participated in student lead conferences up 10 percent from the prior year. The parent satisfaction survey has shown 93% satisfaction with student-led conferences.

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.

38.8% of all students scored proficient or distinguished in reading compared to the state average of 54.6%
35.8% of students scored proficient or distinguished in math compared to the state average of 48.6%
69.6% of students scored proficient in science compared to the state average of 31.7%.

Trends

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

Proficiency in Reading and Math is consistently below the state average for the past 2 years. Science proficiency is well below average while student behavior referrals have shown steady decline per month. Community support has increased steadily in the past two years in attendance of events and surveys completed by parents have shown an increase in satisfaction.

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](#)

Reading, Math & Science: Designing and Deploying Standards and using a monitoring system to ensure the curriculum(s) is taught at a high level of fidelity (e.g., complete document is consistently used by all staff, the intent of the standard is preserved.) Reading & Math: Design and Deliver Instruction where teachers determine the most appropriate and effective high yield strategies to implement in order to ensure congruency to the intent of the learning target.


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%.

The Student Growth indicator score for Wright Elementary was a 67.6 (HIGH GROWTH) showing that the growth of our students in Math and Reading is occurring and our instruction is making an impact. We must leverage this instruction that is making an impact and continue to use best practices to continue the trajectory of growth to make an impact on proficiency. Valid and reliable curriculum and mastery scales in Reading, Math, Science and Writing is being used to plan instruction in all classrooms.

Attachment Summary

| Attachment Name | Description | Associated Item(s) |
|---|-------------|--------------------|
|  KPREP DATA ANALYSIS YEAR TO YEAR | | • |