



# 2020-21 Harmony Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools\_08252020\_14:11

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**Harmony Elementary School**

**Suzie Hackmiller**

1901 S. Highway 1793

Goshen, Kentucky, 40026

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	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?

IMPACT Survey: Analyzed in May 2020 by school Administrative Team Further analysis of IMPACT survey with each grade level PLC in October of 2020 to narrow focus and specify actions that would result in an improvement KPREP: • Received September 2019 • Shared with all staff on September 27, 2019 • Shared with PTA on October 8, 2019 • Analyzed with all staff utilizing Data Carousel Protocol on October 18, 2019 in an effort to determine the reasons for the data • Grade level data analyzed in specific grade level PLC's during week of November 4, 2019 • Individual teachers in grade 3-5 will complete an analysis of individual class KPREP data and discussion with principal 2020 NO KPREP data available due to COVID NWEA MAP: • Analyzed grade level Reading and Math data by Administrative Team October 2020 • Individual classroom MAP data analyzed in grade level PLC's October 2020 • Student goal setting October/early November 2020 • MAP Fall 2020 Student Progress Report shared with parents October 2020 • This data analysis will continue with each administration of MAP (fall, winter, spring) • A school level quadrant chart is being developed to target specific groups BRIGANCE: • Initial Brigance data was analyzed and reviewed September 2019 with K teachers and interventionists DRA: • Fall DRA data was collected and analyzed by classroom teachers and interventionists September 2020 • Administrative Team analyzed historical DRA data for each grade in October 2020 DIBELS: FALL DIBELS for all K students was analyzed and reviewed with all K teachers and interventionists Administrative Team will lead each grade level PLC through a triangulation analysis of data (DRA, KPREP, BRIGANCE, MAP, DIBELS) November 2020

## 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.

Reading as evidenced by KPREP 71.1% of all students scored P/D in reading on 2018/19 KPREP as compared to 68.1% in 2017/18...an increase of 3%. 2017/18 3rd grade % P/D in reading=61.2 4th grade % P/D in reading=68 5th grade % P/D in reading=75 2018/19 3rd grade % P/D in reading=67 4th grade % P/D in reading=72.7 5th grade % P/D in reading=72.9 Novice students in reading 2017/18 3rd=13.2% 4th=6.4% 5th=8% 2018/19 3rd=9% 4th=4% 5th=7% Decrease in the percentage of N in reading from 3rd to 4th grade (apples to apples). Percentage of N in reading from 4th to 5th grade (apples to apples) stayed relatively the same. 2017/18 51% of 49 FRL students scored P/D in reading. 19.7% of 49 FRL students scores N in reading. The gap is narrowing over time and the % of poverty students at proficiency is relatively the same over 4 years with the exception of 1617. 37.3% of 51 students with disabilities scored P/D in reading. 35.7% of 51 students with disabilities scored N in reading. The gap is not narrowing. 2018/19 46% of 50 FRL students scored P/D in reading. The gap has widened again with the increased growth in P/D of the general population. 43.5% of 46 students with disabilities scored P/D in reading. The gap is narrowing. Math as evidenced by KPREP 68% of all students scored P/D in math on 2018/19 KPREP as compared to 65.4% in 2017/18...increase of 2.4% 2017/18 3rd grade % P/D in math=61% 4th grade % P/D in math=61% 5th grade %

---

P/D in math=74% 2018/19 3rd grade % P/D in math=58.5% 4th grade % P/D in math=66.9% 5th grade % P/D in math=76.7% Percentage of P/D in math has increased from 3rd to 4th grade 5.9%. Increase in percentage of P/D in math from 4th to 5th grade 15.7%. Novice students in math 2017/18 3rd=8.3% 4th=12% 5th=2.4% 2018/19 3rd=6% 4th=11.6% 5th=3% Percentage of students scoring Novice in math decreased from 4th to 5th grades. Percentage of students scoring Novice in math increased from 3rd to 4th grades. 34% of 50 FRL students scored P/D in math. 39.1% of 46 students with disabilities scored P/D in math. Gaps in both groups are narrowing in math. Writing as evidence by KPREP 70.5% students scored PD in writing as compared to 65.3% in 2017/18. Increase 5.2%. 7% of students scored N in writing in 2018/19 as compared to 6.5% students scored N in writing in 2017/18. 56.3% FRL students scored P/D in writing in 2018/19 as compared to 38.9% FRL students scored P/D in writing in 2017/18. 47.4% students with disabilities scored P/D in writing in 2018/19 as compared to 13.3% students with disabilities scored P/D in writing in 2017/18. 2018/19 KPREP Overall Proficiency Total= 88.9% = high Reading= 89 Math=88.8 Separate Academic Indicators: Total=82.6 = very high Science=76.7 Social Studies=88.2 OD Writing=82.9 Growth: Total=62.3 = high Reading=57.5 Math=68 Fall 2018 DRA 68% of students K-5 are meeting the fall benchmark. Fall 2018 MAP Math: 68% of 3rd graders are P/D. 77% of 4th graders are P/D. 70% of 5th graders are P/D. Reading: 69.8% of 3rd graders are P/D. 75.8% of 4th graders are P/D. 66.9% of 5th graders are P/D. Fall 2019 DRA 75.2% of 1st graders are meeting the fall benchmark. 59.2% of 2nd graders are meeting the fall benchmark. 64.4% of 3rd graders are meeting the fall benchmark. 51.9% of 4th graders are meeting the fall benchmark. 79.6% of 5th graders are meeting the fall benchmark. Fall 2018 MAP Math: 68% of 3rd graders are P/D. 77% of 4th graders are P/D. 70% of 5th graders are P/D. Reading: 69.8% of 3rd graders are P/D. 75.8% of 4th graders are P/D. 66.9% of 5th graders are P/D. Fall 2019 MAP Math: 73% of 3rd graders are P/D. 79.3% of 4th graders are P/D. 74.3% of 5th graders are P/D. Reading: 71.8% of 3rd graders are P/D. 65% of 4th graders are P/D. 88.7% of 5th graders are P/D. Fall 2020 MAP Math: 74% of 3rd graders are performing in the Avg., HiAvg or Hi 83% of 4th graders are performing in the Avg., HiAvg or Hi 81% of 5th graders are performing in the Avg., HiAvg or Hi Reading: 75% of 3rd graders are performing in the Avg., HiAvg or Hi 90% of 4th graders are performing in the Avg., HiAvg or Hi 87% of 5th graders are performing in the Avg., HiAvg or Hi Non Academic data Perception data indicated that 54% of staff felt that they received timely and quality feedback and coaching. Perception data indicated that 70% of staff felt prepared to address issues of diversity.

## 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.

Reading 43.5% of disabled gap students scored proficient on 1819 KPREP test in reading as opposed to 75.2% of non- disabled gap learners. 46% of poverty gap students scored proficient on 1819 KPREP test in reading as opposed to 75.2% of non-poverty gap learners. Math 39.1% of disabled gap students scored proficient on 1819 KPREP test in math as opposed to 72.3% of non- disabled gap learners. 34% of poverty gap students scored proficient on 1819 KPREP test in math as opposed to 73.6% of non-poverty gap learners. Science 14.3% of disabled students scored proficient on 1819 KPREP test in science as opposed to 58.9% of non-disabled gap learners. 22.2% of poverty students scored proficient on 1819 KPREP test in science as opposed to 59.2% of non-poverty gap learners.



## Trends

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

Reading 37% of disabled gap students scored proficient or above on KPREP test in reading in 2017-18 as compared to 43.5% of disabled gap students scoring proficient or above on KPREP test in reading in 2018-2019. 51% of poverty gap students scored proficient or above on KPREP test in reading in 2017-18 as compared to 46% of poverty gap students scored proficient on KPREP test in reading in 2018-19. Math 31.4% of disabled gap students scored proficient or above on KPREP test in math in 2017-18 as compared to 39.1% of disabled gap students scored proficient on KPREP test in math in 2018-19. 35% of poverty gap students scored proficient or above on KPREP test in math in 2017-18 as compared to 34% of poverty gap students scored proficient or above on KPREP test in math in 2018-19. Science 25% of disabled students scored proficient or above in science in 2017-18 as compared to 14.3% of disabled students scored proficient or above on KPREP test in science in 2018-19.

## 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](#)

KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction Process: Ensure that vertical curriculum mapping is occurring to identify instructional gaps, including planning for the introduction of the standard, development and gradual release phases, and arrival at standards mastery. Ensure ongoing professional development in the area of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery. Practice: Ensure that students understand the success criteria within each learning target. ("Our learning target for today is \_\_\_\_\_, and we will know we are successful when we \_\_\_\_\_.") Utilize knowledge of best practice/high yield instructional strategies to aid in curricular adjustments when students fail to meet mastery. Plan for and implement active student engagement strategies. KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy Practice: Create intentional opportunities for students to receive and offer effective feedback during learning. Implement student participation in self-assessment and goal setting. Condition: Ensure that grades effectively and accurately communicate student achievement.

## 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%.

Percentages of P/D Reading: remained 68% between 16/17 and 17/18 and 71.1 in 2018-19 Math: increased from 59% in 16/17 to 65% in 17/18 (+6%) and to 68 in 2018-19 (+3%) Writing: increased from 58% in 16/17 to 65.3% in 17/18 (+7.3%) to 82.9 in 2018-19 (+17.6%) NAPD Reading: 86.4 in 2017-18 to 89 in 2018-19 Math: 86 in 2017-18 to 88.8 in 2018-19 Science: 73 in 2017-18 to 76.7 in 2018-19 SS: 85.4 in 2017-18 to 88.2 in 2018-19 Writing: 66 in 2017-18 to 82.9 in 2018-19 2018/19 KPREP Overall Proficiency Total= 88.9% = high Reading= 89 Math=88.8 Separate Academic Indicators: Total=82.6 = very high Science=76.7 Social Studies=88.2 OD Writing=82.9 Growth: Total=62.3 = high Reading=57.5 Math=68

# Attachment Summary

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