



# 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Kenwood Station Elementary

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**Kenwood Station Elementary School**

**Mary Garrett**

6321 Veterans Memorial Pkwy

Crestwood, Kentucky, 40014

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?

Annually, school data is shared with parents when it is synthesized in the principal newsletter and the with a link to the School Report Card. These results are also shared annually with the Oldham County Board of Education and the Kenwood SBDM Council, which is comprised of parents and teachers from Kenwood Station. Within the school, teachers reflect annually on KPREP data and three times per year on smaller data such as MAP, DRA, and On-Demand writing. The results of this data analysis are shared school-wide by the MTSS team. The MTSS team meets monthly to review data points and track progress toward goals.

## 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.

Academic State: Reading achievement has a downward trend line spanning from 14-15 to the 18-19 school year. In the 14-15 school year, 74% of our students were P/D in reading. In 2018-2019, 68% of our students were P/D. In reading, our disability GAP has increased over the past 3 years. In 16-17, our GAP for disability was 19.6% compared to 28.8% in 18-19. Math achievement has a downward trend line spanning from 14-15 to the 18-19 school year. In the 14-15 school year, 68% of our students were P/D in math. In 18-19 66% of our students were P/D. Our disability GAP has closed some over the past 5 years as a result of the total percent of students scoring in the P/D range decreasing. In 2018-2019, 56% of our students were P/D in writing. This was a drop from the 17-18 school year when the score was 58%. Non-Academic State: Currently, based on the IMPACT survey (19/20) 100% of staff feel school leaders are "quite friendly" or "extremely friendly", and 100% of staff believe school leaders have the best interests of the school in mind. Based on IMPACT survey (19/20) 73% believe school leaders are effective at developing rules for students that facilitate learning. In the 19/20 school year there were 13 students who received 3 or more discipline referrals to the front office.

## 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.

On the KPREP test, students of poverty increased reading proficiency in 18-19 as compared to 17-18. In 17-18, students of poverty scored 44% proficient/distinguished in reading. In 18-19, these students scored 52% proficient/distinguished in reading. On the KPREP test, reading proficiency scores dropped from 72% in 17-18 to 68% in 18-19. In 18-19, Thirty-two percent (66%) of students scored proficient/distinguished in math on the KPREP test as opposed to forty-seven percent (68%) in 17-18.

## Trends

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

Academic State: Math achievement has a downward trend line spanning from 14-15 to the 18-19 school year. In the 14-15 school year, 68% of our students were P/D in math. In 18-19 66% of our students were P/D. Our disability GAP has closed some over the past 5 years as a result of the total percent of students scoring in the P/D range decreasing. In 2018-2019, 56% of our students were P/D in writing. This was a drop from the 17-18 school year when the score was 58%. Non-Academic State: Currently, based on the IMPACT survey (19/20) 100% of staff feel school leaders are "quite friendly" or "extremely friendly", and 100% of staff believe school leaders have the best interests of the school in mind. Based on the Tell-Like survey from Spring 2019, 93% of teachers agree or strongly agree that they have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students. Based on the Tell-Like survey from Spring 2019, 96% of teachers agree or strongly agree that parents are influential decision makers in the school.



## 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 need to develop a clear scope and sequence in all subject areas and align this vertically K-5. We believe we need more vertical alignment; discussions about what kids need to know each year/which essential standards they will learn each year in core areas. Also, calibration of grading and expectations from grade-level to grade-level. We need to increase feedback to student writers and include meaningful writing across all content areas. We need to build writing stamina with more opportunities to write authentically for short periods of time. We need to look into our dedicated tier 2 intervention time and look for data trends. We need to ask, has this time produced the desired improvements in our GAP groups? On the reverse side, has it produced a negative impact on the non RTI students? We need to create science transfer tasks after each unit to allow students more opportunities for analyzing and interpreting data. In the area of reading and writing, we are implementing the Lucy Calkins units rather than using teacher created resources. These units will increase use of Thinking Strategies and Workshop Model (w/ gradual release). We need to ensure a balanced approach to literacy- Are we getting enough time across grade levels for all components?

## 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%.

On our MAP data in reading, less students fall below the beginning-of-year norm this year than last year at this time. This shows that even in NTI our students were able to maintain their skills as readers. For example, in third grade last year there were 35 students below the norm on the first MAP test of the year. This year, there are only 18 below the norm. The only grade that this positive trend doesn't occur is 2nd grade. There were 12 students below the norm and now there are 20. This hold true for math in all but two grade levels. In all levels (except for 3rd and 5th) there are fewer students below the mean this fall than last fall. Math MAP Data: First Grade Fall 2019: 16 First Grade Fall 2020: 16 Second Grade Fall 2019:12 Second Grade Fall 2020: 20 Third Grade Fall 2019: 35 Third Grade Fall 2020: 18 Fourth Grade Fall 2019: 33 Fourth Grade Fall 2020: 20 Fifth Grade Fall 2019: 26 Fifth Grade Fall 2020: 26

# Attachment Summary

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