

## 2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools\_09102019\_12:10

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**Camargo Elementary School**

Dudley Napier  
4307 Camargo Rd  
Mt Sterling, Kentucky, 40353  
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2019

Last Modified: 11/01/2019

Status: Open

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

2019-20 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
Attachment Summary .....	11

## 2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

### 2019-20 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/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. 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/district councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

KPREP and MAP data is reviewed by SBDM 4 times per year. Grade level teams present classroom level data to SBDM each month on a rotating basis. PLC data discussions occur with all grade-level teams each month. Staff reviews data bi-annually (KPREP, MAP, and relevant classroom sources) during whole school data days. The intervention team reviews whole school data quarterly in primary and 3 times per year to make sure the needs of students are being met in the most appropriate way. Data reviews are documented through SBDM agendas & minutes, PLC Data Wall entries and Data Day sign-in sheets, agendas, and intervention team monthly meeting sign-in sheets.

## 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 (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (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 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

Camargo Elementary 2018-2019 KPREP reading scores show that 48.7% of our students scored at the proficient/distinguished level. Reading scores also show that 26.9% of students scored apprentice and 24.2% scored novice. In 2017-2018, 49.9% of students scored at the proficient distinguished level, while 26.5% scored apprentice and 22.6% scored novice. In 2016-2017 45% of students scored P/D and 28.6% scored apprentice, while 26% scored novice. Camargo Elementary 2018-2019 KPREP math scores show that 42% of our students scored proficient or distinguished. Math scores also show that 38.9 % of our students scored apprentice and 19.1% of our students scored novice. In 2017-2018, 45.7% of our students scored proficient or distinguished in math, 36% scored apprentice and 17.9% scored novice. In 2016-2017, 50.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished, 34.7% scored apprentice and 15% scored novice.

## Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

**NOTE:** These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

**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.

-Eighty-four percent of students with disabilities scored below proficiency in reading as opposed to fifty-one percent of students not identified in that group.-Eighty-four percent of students with disabilities scored novice or apprentice in math as opposed to fifty-eight percent of students not identified in that group.

## Trends

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

Over the last three years, our KPREP reading score for all students has averaged 47.8% scoring in the proficient/distinguished category. There has not been a consistent trend; there was a slight improvement in 17-18 and a slight decline in 18-19. From 16-17 to 18-19 there is some minor improvement noted from overall 45% P/D in reading to 48.7%. However, the average of all students scoring apprentice in reading is 27.3% and the average scoring novice is 24.2%. The proficient/distinguished KPREP math scores are trending downward over time from 50.2% in 16-17 to 42% in 18-19, averaging 45.9%. When looking at all students scoring apprentice in math over time, the average is 25% and an average of 17.3% of all students scoring novice. The number of all students scoring novice in reading in 2017-2018 was 24.2% compared to 48.2% of students with disabilities scoring novice in reading. The number of all students scoring novice in math in 2017-2018 was 17.9% compared to the 48.4% of students with disabilities scoring novice in math. In 2016-2017, the percent of all students scoring novice in reading was 26.15% and the percent of all students scoring novice in math was 15%. In comparison, 52.6% of students with disabilities scored novice in reading and 32.8% of those same students scored novice in math. The trend over time reveals that there is a disproportionate number of students with disabilities performing at the novice level in both reading and math. This discrepancy reveals significant room for improvement for our students with disabilities.



## 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](#)

Our school will focus on Designing and Delivering Instruction. Our instructional monitoring focus is rigorous instructional design and meaningful, engaging instruction. Educators have protected common planning time, participate in monthly horizontal curriculum and assessment planning, and are provided the tools and resources needed to deliver instruction. Educators are also participating in ongoing professional learning around Marzano's high yield instructional strategies. Teachers lead the monthly meetings and share a strategy they have used along with their reflections around that strategy. To address the identified discrepancy found in our students with disabilities population, we are in the year-one implementation of the co-teaching model, assuring our students have the support they need to access the grade-level content while receiving instruction in the classroom setting along with their peers. Co-teachers are participating in a co-teaching cadre that meets monthly. The cadre focuses on best practices in co-teaching to support student learning.

## 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 the 2018-2019 KPREP, 48.9% of students scored proficient/distinguished in reading which is slightly more than the three year average of 47.2%.

---

## Attachment Summary

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