

2018 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09172018_13:23

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Mapleton Elementary School

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

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2018

Last Modified: 11/05/2018

Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
Protocol	4
Current State	5
Priorities/Concerns	6
Trends	7
Potential Source of Problem.....	8
Strengths/Leverages	9
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	10

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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

School Council: Dawn Cockrell - Principal, Jamie Allison - Parent, Elizabeth Davis - Parent, Joy Larrison- Teacher, Whitney Lee - Teacher, and Meghan Stull - Teacher (SBDM meets monthly and more frequently if needed. Meetings are documented with a posted agenda and minutes.) Planning Leadership Team: Dawn Cockrell - Principal, Holly Smallwood - K Teacher, Jaime Hall - 1st Teacher, Melissa Wilson 2nd Teacher, Melissa Anderson 3rd Teacher, Courtney Adams 4th Teacher, Marisa Shrouf 5th Teacher, Shirley Ginter - Activity Teacher, Heather Holley- Special Education Teacher Elizabeth Davis - Parent, Cori Diedrich - Curriculum Resource Specialist (This committee 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 an organized work day session 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 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.

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 gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among gap students in Reading from 2017 to 2018.
- 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 2017 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2016.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2018 from 276 in 2017.

Mapleton's scores are above cutscores in all areas (total group and subgroups) except disability proficiency. We are above state average in two of the three categories. Separate Academic Indicator is below state average. Reading from third to fourth with the same group of students is showing growth in the P/D (4.9% increase) and decrease in the Novice (decrease 4%). Math from third to fourth with the same group of students is showing growth in the P/D (10.6%) and decrease in the Novice (2.1%) STATE Average: Mapleton is above state average in both grades in both subjects with P/D %. Comparisons of state average from 16-17 to 17-18: Mapleton has grown further ahead of the state average in all areas except for third grade reading. It didn't grow as far ahead. Our science did not score above state average of SI. Our P/D % is above state average, however, state average includes science, social studies and writing. MAP Data: Reading Below 50th Percentile- K: 37/63=59% 1: 37/66=56% 2: 16/68=24% 3: 33/77=43% 4: 34/91=37% 5: 29/79= 37% Math Below 50th Percentile- K: 44/64=69% 1: 32/66=48% 2: 14/74=19% 3: 45/77=58% 4: 42/91=46% 5: 31/82=38% Reading Above 50th Percentile- K: 41% 1: 44% 2: 76% 3: 57% 4: 63% 5: 63% Math Above 50th Percentile- K: 31% 1: 52% 2: 81% 3: 42% 4: 54% 5: 62%

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

2017-18 percent of novice for third grade reading increased by 6.8%. The percent distinguished in third grade reading declined by 3.3%. Free/Reduced lunch students did not score as high (P/D %) as the overall students in reading and math.

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?

Students with disabilities has been a lower performing proficiency percentage than other categories. According to the 2017-18 reports, students with disabilities fell below the recommended threshold cutscore of 60.5. Their score was 54.6.

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 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 on student leadership teams, service learning, and school kindness initiative.

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%.

Reading from third to fourth with the same group of students is showing growth in the P/D (4.9% increase) and decrease in the Novice (decrease 4%). Math from third to fourth with the same group of students is showing growth in the P/D (10.6.%) and decrease in the Novice (2.1%)
STATE Average: Mapleton is above state average in both grades in both subjects with P/D %.
Comparisons of state average from 16-17 to 17-18: Mapleton has grown further ahead of the state average in all areas except for third grade reading.

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)
-----------------	-------------	---------