

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10252021_10:33

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Woodland Elementary School Dawn Tarquinio

6000 South Woodland Drive Radcliff, Kentucky, 40160 United States of America $2021-22\ Phase\ Two: The\ Needs\ Assessment\ for\ Schools\ -\ 2021-22\ Phase\ Two: The\ Needs\ Assessment\ for\ Schools\ -\ 10252021\ -\ 10:33\$

Generated on 12/16/2021

Woodland Elementary School

| 1 | Га | h | l۵ | οf | Co | nt | en | ıts |
|---|----|---|----|----|---------------|----|----|-----|
| 1 | | u | | v | $-\mathbf{u}$ | | | |

| 2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools Understanding Continuous Imp | 3 |
|--|---|
| Attachment Summary | 7 |



2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment for Schools

The Needs Assessment Diagnostic will facilitate the use of multiple sources of data to determine the current reality and establish a foundation for decision-making around school goals and strategies. Once completed, the diagnostic will lead to priorities to be addressed in the comprehensive school improvement plan to build staff capacity and increase student achievement. The needs assessment 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).

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes).

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 to 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.

Protocol

1. Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results to determine the priorities from this year's needs assessment. Include names of school councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved, a timeline of the process, the specific data reviewed, and how the meetings are documented.

Upon receipt of state test results, the staff is briefed on overall results. In the following weeks, teachers work in Action Teams to disaggregate data utilizing the KASC test score graphs directions. During Action Team meetings, parents and community members are invited, but in past years, no other stakeholders besides staff have attended. This data is considered at weekly PLC meetings and emphasized when analyzing unit assessments, common assessments and other formative assessment data. Individual students data sheets are shared with parents by enclosing in the first quarter report cards. A parent night is held annually in conjunction with a Title I meeting so that parents can have individual MAP (now



iReady) and KPREP data interpreted and any questions answered. Complete results shared and analyzed with staff September 22, 2021. Shared with SBDM October 27, 2021

Trends

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

Example of Trends

- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2019-20 to 288 in 2020-21.
- From 2018 to 2020, the school saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.

From the 18-19 school year, the percent of students scoring in the Proficient/ Distinguished category has decreased. Current iReady school data shows the same trend with only 7.4% of 1st-5th grade students on grade level in Math and 20.4% of 1st-5 grade students on grade level in Reading.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



3 Year Analysis

Current State

3. Plainly state the current condition of the school using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by multiple sources of outcome data. 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.
- 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 rate was 84% for the 2020-21 academic year.
- Survey results and perception data indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.



Overall, 51.8% of students in grades 3-5 on KSA scored Proficient/Distinguished in Reading compared to 35.6% in the district. Overall, 43.4% of students in grades 3-5 on KSA scored Proficient/Distinguished in Math compared to 27.5% in the district. Overall, 20.8% of students in grade 4 on KSA scored Proficient/Distinguished in Science compared to 16.9% in the district. Overall, 17.6% of students in grade 5 on KSA scored Proficient/Distinguished in ODW compared to 12.1% in the district. Currently, according to iReady, _____%

| AT | TAC | H | MEN | NTS |
|----|-----|---|-----|-----|
| | | | | |

Attachment Name Woodland-HCS Comparison

Priorities/Concerns

4. Clearly and concisely identify the greatest 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.

All students, despite gap, are scoring significantly below district and state data in reading AND Math. Please see attachment.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



Woodland NAPD By Groups

Strengths/Leverages

5. Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school. Explain how they may be utilized to improve areas of concern listed above.

Example: Reading achievement has increased from 37% proficient to its current rate of 58%. The systems of support we implemented for reading can be adapted to address our low performance in math.



Behavior Interventions have improved as evidenced by a reduced number of students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior KSI.

Evaluate the Teaching and Learning Environment

6. Consider the processes, practices and conditions evident in the teaching and learning environment as identified in 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

Utilizing implementation data, perception data, and current policies and practices:

- a. Complete the Key Elements Template.
- b. Upload your completed template in the attachment area below.

After analyzing the Key Elements of your teaching and learning environment, 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.

NOTE: These elements will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template.

Continued focus on core instruction, assessment and regular implementation and impact checks.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



Woodland Key Elements



Attachment Summary

| Attachment Name | Description | Associated Item(s) | |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--|
| 3 Year Analysis | 3 year data | • 2 | |
| Woodland Key Elements | | • 6 | |
| Woodland NAPD By Groups | | • 4 | |
| Woodland-HCS Comparison | | • 3 | |

