



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_09022020_11:24

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Cawood Elementary School
Melinda Sergent
Cawood, null, 40815

Table of Contents

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	4
Protocol	5
Current State	6
Priorities/Concerns	8
Trends	9
Potential Source of Problem	10
Strengths/Leverages	11

2020-21 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, 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 councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

Teachers, counselor and administrators meet in October or November of each year to review our schools testing data. The dates are relative to when testing data is released. Due to not having KPREP scores for 2019-2020, our school used the Renaissance STAR Reading and Math Screening Data. The teachers work in groups according to subject and grade level in order to review specific content levels. During these meeting the groups look for areas in need of improvement as well as areas of growths. The groups look at individual students' achievement and cut scores to decide which students should participate in various extra programs.

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 percent (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2018 to 2020, the school saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four percent (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 2019-20 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2018-19 to 288 in 2019-20.
- Survey results and perception data indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

The following is data from the 2019/2020 KPREP. We saw a 19.5 % increase in Proficient/Distinguished on KPREP in Elementary Math. -76.9 % of our Elementary students scored proficient/distinguished in reading on KPREP compared to the state average of 51.6 %. -65.4 % of our Elementary students scored proficient/distinguished in math on KPREP compared to the state average of 48.6 %. -63.3 % of our Middle School students scored proficient/distinguished in reading on KPREP compared to the state average of 59.6 %. -48.1 % of our Middle School students scored proficient/distinguished in math on KPREP compared to the state average of 46.4 %. - 80.6 % of our Elementary students scored proficient/distinguished in social studies on KPREP compared to the state average of 53 %. - 85.2 % of our Middle students scored proficient/distinguished in social studies on KPREP compared to the state average of 58.8 %. - 51.5% of our Elementary students scored proficient/distinguished in sciences on KPREP compared to the state average of 31.7%. - 55.6% of our Middle students scored proficient/distinguished in science on KPREP compared to the state average of 26 %. Due to no Spring KPREP in 2020 the following is information used from the fall STAR Math and Reading Screeners. -80% of fourth graders for 20-21 scored less than one grade level behind in math. -74% of third graders for 20-21 scored less than one grade level behind in math. -71% of

fifth graders for 20-21 scored less than one grade level behind in math. -94% of third graders for 20-21 scored less than one level behind in reading. -77% of fourth graders for 20-21 scored less than one grade level behind in reading. -The number of behavior incidents logged into Infinite Campus in 3rd -8th grade decreased from 33 in 2018/19 to 21 in 2019/2020 -Teacher turnover rate dropped from 10% to 5 %. SRO Officers work with us and serve in the roles of law enforcement officer and community liaison. When asked about the SRO officers' involvement at school, the parents surveyed felt that the students felt safe at school and that helped them to succeed. The parents also felt like that the smaller class size due to the classroom reduction teacher helped the students to succeed also.

Priorities/Concerns

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

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template.

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.

Since, there was no KPREP testing this is information from the 2019/2020 year. We had a 6.3 % decrease in students scoring proficient in Middle School math on the 2018/19 KPREP in math. -64.5% Elementary students and 88.9 % of Middle School students scored below proficiency in writing on 2018/2019 KPREP testing. The following is information from the Fall 2020 STAR Screenings. -57% of 7th graders for 2020 scored greater than one year behind in math. -48% of 8th graders for 2020 scored greater than one year behind in math. -48% of 6th graders for 2020 scored greater than one year behind in math. -61% of 7th graders for 2020 scored greater than one year behind in reading. -47% of 8th graders for 2020 scored greater than one year behind in reading.

Trends

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

Math continues to be an area in need of improvement. Middle school students scored an average 51.9% below proficient in KPREP in 2019 compared to 45.6% In KPREP testing for in 2018, an increase of 6.3% more students below proficient. Eighth grade being the greatest targeted grade level which was 59.3% below the average of Proficient and Distinguished.

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](#)

We have identified at-risk students that are falling below proficiency in the area of Math. We are identifying curriculum gaps that may contribute to poor student performance. Those gaps are being addressed through supplemental instruction as needed. We have also compared our areas of strengths to our areas of weakness concerning instructional strategies, and we are making appropriate adjustments in instructions to meet students' needs

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%.

Since, there was no state testing due to the Pandemic we are basing this information on the previous year's data. Cawood Elementary has been identified as a 4 Star school for the 2018-2019 school year on KPREP. The elementary has an overall average of 74.3, which is considered a "high" in the school ratings. The elementary Proficiency Indicator is 89.1 for reading and math. For the areas of science, social studies, and writing, we have a "high" rating with a score of 76.9 Our middle school is identified as a 3 Star school which is also ranked as "high" for 2018-2019 on KPREP. The middle school has an overall average score of 66.2 Our middle school proficiency indicator is 75 for reading and math, which is considered medium. For the areas science, social studies and writing is a 71, which is considered a high score.

Attachment Summary

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