

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic_11212017_13:56

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

Erpenbeck Elementary School

Jennifer Watson
9001 Wetherington Blvd
Florence, Kentucky, 41042
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/06/2017

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	7

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

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 shareholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

Data results are analyzed by the administration team (Pat Berry, Eddy Bushelman, Ashley Goheen, Jill Baird, and Kyle Holloway). Data results were shared with our teaching team as well in a faculty meeting. It was clear from our analysis that EES performed better in math than in reading and that we have a lot of room for improvement with our Gap Groups and their academic achievement. Our entire teaching staff has been involved with both data review and with working through the Key Core Work Processes to analyze strengths and to determine areas of improvement for needs and next steps. Our SBDM (Sarah Foltz, Kim Fry, Katie Piercefield, Cici Luna, Carlos Johnson, and Pat Berry) are also involved with data review and next steps. After initial leadership team data reviews; we felt that it was necessary to have our entire teaching staff do an analysis with the Key Core Work Processes. This was done over the course of two PLC meetings. These meetings are held weekly 3 out of the 4 weeks each month. Each teaching team completed the Key Core Work Processes as a team (instead of the staff as a whole completing it). So we actually ended up with approximately 8/9 separate Key Core Work Processes analysis. The staff analysis of the Key Core Work Process revealed the same concerns that the administrative analysis did - a definite need for formative/summative assessment alignment in the area of reading (we are aligned in math and the results show that) was a major finding for every team. The administration team felt that it would not only be beneficial for the teaching staff to complete the Key Core Work Processes analysis but that it would also be very reaffirming if both groups (admin and teaching staff) came up with the same general results which is what happened. Another problem of practice that our Team Leaders had identified was student engagement within cooperative group activities. This led EES to look to teacher training in Kagan Structures to help fill this need that directly impacts all students and especially Gap Group students. We now have over 1/2 of our teachers training in Kagan Structures. We have dedicated a faculty meeting to trained teachers sharing/training with our staff about the various Kagan Structures and how they are used in their classes. The administration team is using one PLC meeting each month with the teacher team to showcase and highlight a Kagan Structure.

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 non-duplicated gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2015 to 2016.
- 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 2016 schools year – a decrease from 92% in 2015.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2017 from 276 in 2016.

According to the data in the Erpenbeck school report card: In 2015-16, 62.9% of our non-duplicated gap students scored proficient/distinguished in KPREP reading. In 2015-16, 56.9% of our non-duplicated gap students scored proficient/distinguished in KPREP math. In 2015/16 our Asian Gap Group did meet delivery target and did score as well/better than our entire student body. In 2014/15 and 2015/16 our Free and Reduced Lunch Gap Group did meet delivery targets in math. In looking at our recent discipline data (Infinite Campus) -relative to our discipline data over the past 8 -10 years, the past 2/3 years has been very up and down at EES. In 2015-16 we had double the discipline referrals from the previous year 2014/15 and then cut that almost in half in 2016/17. We are seeing some student transiency that is impacting us in some ways, one of them being with some increased barriers to learning. Based on need - in the 2016/17 school year we added North Key (counseling services) in house at our school to help meet student/family mental health issues.

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 students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

Students with Disabilities Gap Group have gone from 14/15 having 34% proficient/distinguished to 15/16 having 37.5% proficient/distinguished to 16/17 having 16.7% proficient/distinguished in reading. This same patterns replicates itself in math. In 14/15 we had 25% proficient/distinguished to 15/16 having a 33% proficient/distinguished to 16/17 having 12.5% proficient/distinguished. Both sets of these numbers for reading and math reflect not only a significant drop but also show from scoring above the district and state level for two years to scoring below the district and state level last year. This is a priority focus of concern and planning for next steps. The non-duplicated Gap Group did meet the delivery target in both reading and math in school year 2015/16 but did not meet either delivery target in school year 2016/17. So we are very focused on quality core instruction that is beneficial for all students and especially Gap Group students.

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?

In terms of a big picture view of academic achievement, EES has significant areas of improvement with our Gap Groups in all subjects. Our Gap Group students fared slightly better in math than in reading, but Gap Group achievement remains a focus because of the need to improve in that area. A specific area of concern looking at data trends is the performance of our students in our Disabilities Gap Group students over the past several years. We have gone from being above the district and state scores in both reading and math in 14/15 & 15/16 to scoring below the district and state in both reading and math in 16/17. This is part of why a major focus of plans going forward addresses our Disabilities Gap Group.

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 school improvement strategies outlined below:

[1- Deployment of Standards](#)

[2- Delivery of Instruction](#)

[3- Assessment Literacy](#)

[4- Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results](#)

[5- Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus](#)

[6- Establish a Learning Culture and Environment](#)

In the Design and Delivery of Instruction improvement strategy we identified the following bullets as needs: What system is in place to ensure students take responsibility for their own learning? How does the teacher ensure cognitive engagement versus passive or active engagement? What strategies and programs are implemented in classrooms and how do you measure their effectiveness on student achievement? We are using Kagan Structures as a focus to address these - especially in the area of cognitive engagement vs passive or active engagement. We feel that when students are not being engaged in a classroom or "hiding" when engagement normally occurs that the existing gap will only widen. The Kagan Structures are a way on setting up classroom groupings/structures to ensure that all students participate/engage with the curriculum/peers. We feel that this is an essential strategy for EES going forward. Another school improvement strategy that we are focusing on after our Key Core Work Processes analysis is the Review Analyze and Apply Data Results strategy. From this work we are adopting a common form of assessment that will be used in reading. This will allow vertical and horizontal analysis of student progress and achievement. Out of the Design and Delivery of Instruction strategy and data analysis we see the need to implement a consistent learning structure for our Disabilities Gap Group students. We are beginning to implement the Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program with our special education teachers to use with our special education students. These are the three key practices that we will be implementing to address the identified needs.

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%.

Our Asian Gap Group students have consistently scored about the district and state level the past several years in both reading and math. In fact this Gap Group has scored higher than our student body in math a couple of years. Our Free and Reduced Gap Group students have also scored above the district and state level in both reading and math the past three years. Our Non-duplicated Gap Group has also scored above the district and state level in both reading and math the past three years.

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)
 EES gap and academic data	Gap Group scores	