

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10302018_12:19

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Early Learning Village

Larry Murphy
200 Laran Ave
Frankfort, Kentucky, 40601
United States of America

Last Modified: 01/11/2019

Status: Open

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?

ELV uses a comprehensive process to review and analyze school data. The process starts with the leadership team reviewing the data for reflections-- input for celebrations and areas for continued growth discussed. From these conversations, draft school goals are developed. The next step is to present the data to all staff members-- following the same process as described with leadership team. The school goals that are developed from these conversations are then shared with our district leadership for their input as well as our SBDM Council. These school goals and formative school data is frequently reviewed during PLC meetings-- specifically, following the Fall, Winter and Spring MAP data. Teachers will meet in the data room to determine which instructional strategies are proving to be effective towards producing student growth.

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.

According to our Spring 2018 MAP data, we had 65% in the area of reading and 72% in the area of math of students that scored within the 61st percentile or above. Our Fall MAP data indicates that we have, 42% in reading and 30% in math scoring at the 61st percentile or above. From the Spring 2017 to Spring 2018-- there was a 3% decrease in the number of students scoring at the 61st percentile in the area of math and a 9% decrease of students scoring at the 61st percentile in the area of reading. Our school wants to observe an increase in the percentage of students scoring within the 61st percentile range on our MAP assessment. Our school-wide goal is to have 80% or more of our students scoring within the 61st percentile or above on the Spring 2019 MAP assessment. This would reflect a high growth rate of students scoring within the proficient range. Other data that is reviewed on a continuous basis would be our Brigance data and our DRA 2 data. For the Fall of 2018, our school Brigance data shows that 49% of first year kindergarten students are entering kindergarten "Not Ready". This is down 5% from 2017, in which 54% were "Not Ready" for kindergarten. According to our DRA 2 data, --the expectation is for students to be at a level 4 or above on the spring assessment.

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.

68% of our students met the end of the year benchmark for DRA 2 in Spring 2018; 67% of our students met the end of the year benchmark for DRA 2 in Spring 2017. According to our MAP Data, African Americans scored among the lowest in the area of mathematics with only 46% of students meeting the benchmark. According to our MAP Data, Hispanic students scored among the lowest in the area of reading with only 46% of students meeting the benchmark. For the Spring 2018, only 68% of our students met the level 4 end of year expectation for DRA 2.

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?

DRA 2 data is showing that our students are consistently scoring below 70% for meeting the end of the year benchmark. Upon further analysis of this data, comprehension was identified as being an area that needs continued focus in order to make significant gains. Per our MAP Data-- Hispanic students continue to score among the lowest group in the area of reading-- for the Fall 2017 (33% of students meeting benchmark while in Fall 2018-- 46% of students meeting benchmark). African Americans continue to score among the lowest group in the area of mathematics-- for the Fall 2017 (23% of students meeting benchmark while in Fall 2018-46% of students meeting benchmark).

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](#)

Align Writing- align writing program using Lucy Calkins Writing Units of Study to help teachers provide their students with instruction, opportunities of practice and concrete achievable goals to support mastery of writing standards. Guided Reading-Continue coaching sessions with new teachers in the building to support effective implementation of guided reading instruction among students. Align Math- Teachers will utilize Eureka Math to develop differentiated instruction based on students knowledge, understanding and mastery of common core standards within each unit. Progress Monitoring Meetings for Academics-Continue to strengthen our progress monitoring and intentional planning for Tier II interventions to determine the effectiveness of instructional practices.

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%.

For the past three years, our students have exceeded the benchmark in Spring Math Map assessment [2016 (83%), 2017 (84% and 2018 (82%)] 89% of our students met the DRA 2 recommendation exit level for kindergarten.

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)
-----------------	-------------	---------