



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_09082020_17:31

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Mapleton Elementary School

Dawn Cockrell

809 Indian Mound Dr
Mt Sterling, Kentucky, 40353
United States of America

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	7
Trends	8
Potential Source of Problem	9
Strengths/Leverages	10

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?

School Council: Dawn Cockrell - Principal, Elizabeth Davis - Parent, Heather Gruneisen - Teacher, Joy Larrison- Teacher, Whitney Lee - Teacher, and Jody Sammons - Parent. SBDM meets monthly and more frequently if needed. Meetings are documented with a posted agenda and minutes. Planning Leadership Team: Dawn Cockrell - Principal, Casey Greene - Assistant Principal, Lacy Gross - Counselor, Erin Shillington - FRC Director, Joy Larrison - Title I Coordinator & Literacy Committee Chair, Kristi Garrison - Library/Media Specialist & Literacy Committee Vice Chair, Sammi Hatfield - Culture, Wellness, & Assessment Committee Chair, Marisa Hogge - Math/Science/Social Studies Committee Chair, Jennifer Larsen - Special Education Lead Teacher. This Leadership Team meets two times per month and more frequently if needed. Meetings are documented with an agenda and minutes recorded. Data is analyzed by the school staff in organized work day sessions (fall and winter) led by the Planning Leadership Team. Results from this data review are used to share with SBDM and outline goals, strategies, and activities for improvement in the school's improvement plan. The school's improvement plan is presented to Council for approval. It is monitored during the committee meetings and the implementation and impact of the plan is presented to Council quarterly. Unit assessment data results are analyzed by grade level teams with the Principal during PLCs. Results from these assessments are used to plan additional supports and interventions for Standards Based Grading implementation and RTI.

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.

Mapleton's scores are above state proficiency cutscores in all areas (total group and subgroups) except economically disadvantaged students in science P/D average was 27.1% and state average is 31.7%. disability proficiency. Reading from third to fourth with the same group of students is showing growth in the P/D (7.2% increase) and decrease in the Novice (decrease 7.6%). Reading from fourth to fifth with same group is showing growth in P/D (11.8 increase) and decrease in Novice (decrease 1.6%). Math from third to fourth with the same group of students is showing growth in the P/D (5.5% increase) but an increase in the Novice (5.5% increase). Math from fourth to fifth with same group is showing very slight decrease in P/D (1% decrease) but a significant decrease in Novice (4.1% decrease). STATE Average: Mapleton is above state average in all three grades in all subjects with P/D %. Comparisons of state average from 16-17 to 17-18 to 18-19: Mapleton has grown further ahead of the state average in all areas except for third grade reading and math. Our Writing is significantly above state average (32.6 points), and our social studies is significantly above state average (17.1 points). Science is barely above state average .9 points.
MAP Data:

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.

2019 percent of novice for third grade reading decreased by 3.3% from 2018 but is not as low as 2017 by 2.5%. The third grade P/D in reading is the lowest in 2019 of the three years (61.3, 48, 55.3). Third grade math has the lowest % of P/D in three years (51.4, 56.5, 50). Novice % increased from 2018. (12.7, 8, 10.5). Free/Reduced lunch students did not score as high (P/D %) as the overall students in reading and math. Fourth grade science is barely above state average and our economically disadvantaged students are below state average. Third and fourth grade disability % P/D did not score above state average in reading and disability group scored below state average at all grades in math.

Trends

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

Students with disabilities has been a lower performing proficiency percentage than other categories. Third and fourth grade disability % P/D did not score above state average in reading and disability group scored below state average at all grades in math.

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](#)

1. The school will continue to work in grade level and district horizontal teams to continuously revise, analyze, and align curriculum. Assessment data will continuously be reviewed and analyzed with adjustments made to instructional strategies. 2. To ensure the instructional program is intentional and of the highest quality with a focus on active engagement, teachers will work together as a team including the administration and curriculum resource specialist. Analysis of student work as a team will be completed as well as a sharing of effective instructional strategies and research on additional research based strategies. 3. Continuing the school wide implementation of Standards Based Grading with additional emphasis on students truly "owning" their data and progress through the use of student data notebooks, student led conferences/peer reviews, and student self reflection strategies. 4. Continued implementation of Standards Based Grading and regular ongoing analysis of student assessment (formative and summative results as a team and individually. 5. Ongoing SAT team meetings to discuss progress of students in critical need for improvement and the RTI model. 6. School wide focus will continue on student leadership teams, service learning, and school kindness initiative.

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%.

STATE Average: Mapleton is above state average in all three grades in all subjects with P/D %. Our Writing is significantly above state average (32.6 points), and our social studies is significantly above state average (17.1 points). Our fifth grade reading %P/D is also well above state average. Math at fifth grade only had 3.9% Novice. Writing Novice was 5.2%, and Social Studies and Reading Novice percentage was only 6.5%.

Attachment Summary

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