2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09032020_14:17

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Green Hills Elementary School
Jonathan J. Perkins
Bledsoe, null, 40810

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?

Since there was no K-PREP Assessment for the 2019-2020 school year, We are still using the data from our 2018-19 KPREP Assessments, STAR Assessments (At least 3 times per year, more for RTI and struggling students), District Math Benchmark Assessments (3 times per year), and other sources to formulate questions about our academic performance. Specifically, we want to know why our math scores seem to lag behind our other content areas, even though many of our students seem to have ability. Why is there such a discrepancy? The data that we have indicates that we have a problem with our primary, and elementary school math achievement. Why is this? We know that basic skills are lacking as students enter the middle school, but why? In both instances, the data does not reveal why we have these issues. We continue to use the available data to identify common strands that permeate our academic program, both positive and negative. Can we duplicate the positive aspects while identifying and eliminating the negative? There are several groups involved in this process. These include: Our SBDM Council, The District Math Benchmark Collaborative Team, Our School Math Team. The SBDM Council meets monthly as does our school Math Team. The District Math Benchmark Team meets in the summer. In addition, our school teaching staff meets weekly to discuss pertinent issues regarding student achievement. Another key player that is involved in the planning process at GHES is our FRYSC. Peggy Brackett, our Coordinator, plays a vital role in most every aspect of school planning, and is instrumental in the implementation of many of the programs that serve of students and their families. Without our FRYSC, our students would have needs that would go unmet, which in turn would adversely affect their academic performance and personal well-being.

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.

Since we did not complete KPREP Assessments during the Spring of 2020, our data is based on our 2019 KPREP Assessment Data, Green Hills Elementary School enjoys considerable academic achievement in several areas, while struggling in others. We scored at, or above the state averages in 9 content areas. These content areas are as follows: 4th Grade Reading Score of 53 with the state average being 53, 5th Grade Reading Score of 63.6 with the state average of 58, 5th Grade Social Studies Score of 63.6 with the state average of 53, 5th Grade On-Demand Score of 54.5 with the state average of 46.7, 7th Grade Reading Score of 68.8 with the state average of 57.6, 7th Grade Science Score of 37.6 with the state average of 26.1, 8th Grade Reading Score of 76.9 with the state average of 562.8, 8th Grade Social Studies of 84.6 with the state average being 58.9, 8th Grade On-Demand Score of 61.5 with the state average of 32.1. These content areas have consistently shown strength over the last several years. In contrast, we have several content areas where we are experiencing low test scores, despite the efforts we have made to improve. Our Math Program continues to perform poorly, both in our Elementary School, and in our Middle School. Our Elementary Score of 25.6 is far below the state average of 48.6, and our Middle School Score was 28.6 lags behind the state average of 46.4. While we do show some growth in both schools, these scores are still of concern

since we have expended a lot of time and resources to provide additional instruction to our students. 100% of GHES stakeholders who were surveyed and responded to the question, indicated that the classroom reduction teacher position, which is funded through Title II funds positively impacted student learning in the elementary school. These findings were substantiated through the administration of STAR Assessments, KPREP Data and other assessment data. These findings, when coupled with the improved teacher/student ratios, enhances our ability to differentiate and to provide targeted interventions. 100% of the stakeholders surveyed indicated that the high school dual credit program benefits the students of the Harlan County School system by allowing them to complete advanced coursework leading to a college degree while they are still in high school. An added benefit of this program is the positive financial impact it has on family budgets. 100% of stakeholders survey indicated that our SRO program has had an exceptional impact on the safety of our students and the overall level of protection afforded to all students and staff of the Harlan County Public Schools. In addition, 100% percent of the respondents indicated that the presence of SRO's and related services have a positive impact on student behaviors. 93.75% of the stakeholders surveyed indicated that assessments such as STAR are extremely beneficial to curriculum development and guidance while providing much needed diagnostic insight into the specific academic needs of each student assessed.

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.

The major priority at Green Hills Elementary School continues to be the effectiveness of our math instruction and student achievement in this content area. Our Math Program continues to perform below our expectations, both in our Elementary School, and in our Middle School. Based on our most recent K-PREP Data our 3rd Grade Score of 33.3 is below the state average of 47.3, 4rd Grade Score of 11.8 is far below the state average of 46.8, 5th Grade Score of 31.8 is far below the state average of 51.8, 6th Grade Score of 25 is far below the state average of 46.8, 7th Grade Score of 18.8 is far below the state average of 47.3, 8th Grade Score of 38.5 is below the state average of 45.5. These trends are disturbing since we have expended a lot of time and resources to provide additional instruction to our students.

Trends

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

Again, our Math Program is our most pressing area for improvement. The trends support this hypothesis as demonstrated by the following data. Our KPREP Scores have shown a decline in recent years as indicated by the numbers of Proficient/ Distinguished scores: Year Elementary P/D% Middle P/D% Elementary % Novice Middle % Novice 2013-14 39.3% 51.1% 21.4% 10.6% 2014-15 15.5% 28.3% 39.7% 15.2% 2015-16 28% 34.7% 14.0% 12.2% 2016-17 14.3% 16.3% 30.6% 22.4% 2017-18 21.7% 26.7% 37% 8.9% 2018-19 25.6% 28.6% 31.25% 13.5% 2019-20 Data is unavailable. As is clearly evident, we show sub par and very inconsistent performance in the math assessments.

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

While we have worked hard to improve our overall school culture, academic standing, and assessment results, we are falling short in a couple of areas. We are reexamining our current curricular approach to instruction, and our overall tutoring program to determine what changes need to be made to increase our math academic achievement. We suspect that our efforts might be somewhat counterproductive in that small group instruction outside of the classroom might not be as effective due to the classroom instruction missed by those students when they are pulled. It may be more effective to use more of a collaborative approach inside the math classrooms. In addition, we are looking at our instructional practices to identify weaknesses that may be addressed through professional development, or further use of professional learning groups that may identify areas for improvement. We are currently engaged in a comprehensive data analysis effort that can shed light on trends and offer insight to some of the issues we face with our math program. All teachers are engaged in the data analysis in order to utilize the expertise of everyone involved. In addition, the global COVID-19 Pandemic has made it even more difficult to address ever widening gaps created by the loss of in-person instruction and inordinate amounts of virtual instruction that have created learning deficits that may take months, or even years to overcome.

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%.

Green Hills Elementary School has several areas that are strengths. As indicated on our 2019 K-PREP Assessments, our 8th Grade Reading Score of 76.9 P/D surpassed the state average of 62.8 by a wide margin. Out 8th Grade Social Studies score of 84.6 P/D surpassed the state average of 58.9 by a substantial margin. Our 7th Grade Science score of 37.6 P/D surpassed the state average of 26.1 by a substantial margin. 7th Grade Reading score of 68.8 P/D surpassed the state average of 57.6 by a substantial margin. Our 5th Grade Social Studies score of 63.6 P/D surpassed the state average of 53 by a substantial margin. Our 5th Grade Social On-Demand score of 54.5 P/D surpassed the state average of 46.7 by a substantial margin. Our 5th Grade Reading score of 63.6 P/D surpassed the state average of 58 by a substantial margin. Finally, our 4th Grade Reading score of 53 P/D equaled the state average of 53. In total, we scored at, or above the state averages in 9 content areas.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)