



Buckner Elementary 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Buckner Elementary School
Elizabeth Dant
4307 Brown Blvd.
Lagrange, Kentucky, 40031
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	8
Trends	9
Potential Source of Problem	10
Strengths/Leverages	11

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?

A Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (CSIP) committee was formed that included a representative from every grade level, the related arts team, special education teachers, the assistant principal, guidance counselor and principal. The CSIP committee reviewed the 2019-2020 KPREP data (our most recent data at this time), as well as analyzing potential causal factors for the data as well as ideas for improvement. In addition the Leadership Team also met to do an in-depth analysis of the data and the work over a series of weeks. The Leadership Team meets weekly and the CSIP Committee meets monthly. All meetings are documented with an agenda.

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 (based on 2019-2020 KPREP data): -In Reading, Math and Science our NAPD has remained relatively the same. Social Studies and Writing NAPD had a 4 point drop. -We earned 4 stars. We had high achievement in proficiency, growth and separate academic indicator. Reading 67% of our students are proficient or distinguished in reading. This is well above the state avg. of 54.6% (We are 13% higher than the state average.) Our students performed higher than what MAP projected us to be. Our trend line is negative overall in the past 5 years. We have gone from 72% to 67%. 5th grade is 80% P and D in reading. 3rd and 4th grades are both 60% P and D in reading. Each group of kids (those transitioning from 3rd to 4th and those moving from 4th to 5th) have grown. 3rd to 4th went from 57.8% to 59.6% and 4th to 5th went from 63% to 79.4%. We have 12% novice in reading. We have nearly double in Apprentice with 20% (Our core instruction is not meeting the needs of all of our students.) Math We performed higher than MAP projected. -We only have 8.9% novice in math compared to reading (12%) -Number of Proficient students decreased from 64.9 to 61.3% in Mathematics -Our core instruction is not meeting the needs of 80%. -Last years' 4th graders grew from 45.6 to 71.3% -5th grade only had 5.9% novice. -Disability Gap decreased from a 37.7% gap to a 34.5% gap -Poverty Gap decreased from a 38% gap to a 30.5% gap Writing 52% Proficient/

distinguished. This is a decrease from the year before of 53.7% 11.8% novice (which went up from last year with 7.4%) 38.5% of students with IEPs were proficient and distinguished (the gap is only 15.5) Social Studies 69.6% of our students are proficient and distinguished in the area of social studies Only 6% of our students are novice in the area of social studies Our scores went down 5% for non disability students The students with disabilities improved 6% Science Decline in proficient/ distinguished by 2% Novice decreased 0.8% 52% of our students are apprentice in science Only 21% of our students from poverty scored proficient or distinguished in science Non-academic state: Our students, like most students across our country, were forced to move to NTI (learning from home virtually), from March - May and then we also began our school year in the fall of 2020 in this platform. Currently, while we still have 450 at school we still have approximately 165 learning from home.

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.

Although we have tried to provide a quality education under this platform we have not been able to replicate to the same degree the education that occurs in the classroom. This has resulted in some of our students falling behind in reading, writing and math as evidenced by common formative assessments we have given at the start of the year. The lack of growth for the large majority of students is a huge concern for us. Our KPREP data from 2019-2020 also has shown that math has only 61% P and D which lags behind reading where 67% of students are proficient or distinguished. In the area of Mathematics we have been hovering right at 65% for the past 4 years with little movement. We saw a large jump in the area of mathematics four years ago but then have not seen much movement and even a 4% drop this past year. Only 31% of our kids with IEP's are proficient or distinguished in math Our overall 5 year trend line in reading is negative. (72.7% in 2015 to 67.3% in 2019) Our students in poverty performed below the state average in reading (45.1% vs. 45.8%) Writing has dropped in the past 4 years.

Trends

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

The previous two years in reading have gone from a 66.3% in 2017 to 67.3% in 2019. While this looks like a slight increase when you go back 5 years it has been on a decline. The previous two years in math have gone from 65% in 2017 to 61.3% in 2019. This is a decrease although this is an area that we have put a lot of effort into. In addition our students with IEP's in the area of math have seen little improvement in the past five years. Therefore our significant areas for improvement are in core reading and math and the gap with 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 efforts will be focused on KCWP 1 specifically in the area of curriculum. It has been several years since curriculum revisions have been made and therefore teachers have voiced concerns about a guaranteed and viable curriculum. We spent several months last year reviewing what is a guaranteed and viable curriculum and have done an analysis of Buckner's curriculum regarding the degree that our curriculum is guaranteed and viable. The Curriculum Committee has launched a full review of literacy and mathematics curriculum and has made a recommendation to the SBDM Council in the spring of 2020 to revamp the curriculum. In addition with the release of new standards it has offered an opportunity for teachers to review the standards within the units and discuss expected outcomes for each standard. A monitoring system will then need to be developed to ensure that they are all being taught to high levels. The second Key Core Work Process that we will work on is KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction due to our primary concern of our core instruction meeting the needs of all of our students in reading, math and writing. Buckner has moved to a co-teaching model where we have co-teaching classrooms where students with IEP's are clustered and there are two teachers in the room the majority of the day. This will benefit all students and will ensure that all students are getting equitable access to tier I instruction.

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%.

Social Studies proficiency is higher than any other content area. Math 5 year trend line is positive. We had a slight dip last year but we are hopeful it was just a "one year" thing and not a trend. Our overall growth is very high in every subject area. Our students make a great deal of progress from 3rd to 5th grades.

Attachment Summary

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