



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Crestwood E

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Crestwood Elementary School
Elizabeth Wallingford
6500 West Highway 146
Crestwood, Kentucky, 40014
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, including team leaders from each grade level, a related arts teacher, an ECE teacher, the literacy coach, counselor, assistant principal, and principal. The CSIP committee reviewed 2018-19 KPREP data, as well as analyzing potential factors impacting the data. The committee then discussed ideas for improvement. The leadership team (principal, AP, literacy coach, counselor, library media specialist) completed an in-depth analysis of the data and reviewed ideas for improvement. Data and suggested strategies for improvement were reviewed with the SBDM council for consultation before approval was sought. The leadership team meets weekly and the CSIP committee and SBDM council meet monthly, all of which are documented with agendas

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 2018-2019 KPREP data): -In Reading, Math and Science our NAPD has increased slightly. Social Studies NAPD had an 11 point drop. Writing NAPD had a 10 point gain. -We earned 4 stars. We had high achievement in proficiency, growth and separate academic indicator. Reading 62.8% of our students are proficient or distinguished in reading. This is above the state avg. of 54.6% Our students performed lower than our MAP projection of 65.3% proficient or distinguished. Our trend line is slightly positive over the past 5 years. We have gone from 59% to 63%. 5th grade is 69% P/D in reading, 4th grade is 60% P/D in reading, and 3rd grade is 58% P/D in reading. Our cohort of students transitioning from 3rd to 4th maintained a P/D percentage of 60%, while those moving from 4th to 5th have grown from 58% to 69%. We have 13.8% novice in reading. This is most evident in third grade with 22% of students scoring novice. Our 4th and 5th graders are at 10% and 9% novice, respectively. 23% of students are scoring at the apprentice level. The gap in reading proficiency has improved for students with disabilities, student of poverty and students who are 2 or more races, but the gap has increased for hispanic students (27 to 35) and EL students (35 to 48). At this time, our core instruction in reading is not meeting the needs of all of our students. Math We performed higher than MAP projected with 59% of our students at P/D in math on

KPREP in comparison to the 54% projected by MAP. This is above the state average of 48.6% P/D. Our trend line is positive over the past five years. We have gone from 50.5% P/D to 59% P/D. Fifth grade is 66% P/D in math, 4th grade is 52% P/D in math, and 3rd grade is 58% P/D in math. Our cohort of students transitioning from 3rd to 4th dropped from a P/D percentage of 56% to 52%, while those moving from 4th to 5th have grown from 59% to 66%. We have 13.1% novice in math. This is most evident in third grade and fourth grades with 19% and 16% of students scoring novice, respectively. 5th graders are at 5% novice and 29% apprentice, respectively. 28% of total students are scoring at the apprentice level. The gap in math proficiency has improved for students with disabilities, student of poverty and students who are 2 or more races, but the gap has increased for hispanic students (24 to 28) and EL students (30 to 40). Based on Fall 2020 MAP analysis, no grade was meeting the fall benchmark in the area of Operations and Algebraic Thinking. At this time, our core instruction in math is not meeting the needs of all of our students. Writing 70% of students scored proficient/distinguished in writing. This is an increase from 47.1% P/D the year before. 4% of students scored novice, which was a decrease from 7% the year before. The gap in writing proficiency has decreased for students with IEPs from 45 to 39 but it has increased for students of poverty from 8 to 24. Social Studies 57% of students scored proficient/distinguished in social studies. This is a decrease from 68% P/D the year before. 14% of students scored novice, which was an increase from 5% the year before. The gap in social studies proficiency has increased for all gap groups. Our core instruction for social studies is not currently meeting the needs of all students. Science 42% of students scored proficient/distinguished in science. This is an increase from 35% P/D the year before. 10.8% of students scored novice, which was a slight increase from 10.1% the year before. The gap in science proficiency has increased for students with IEPs from 19 to 33 but it has remained relatively steady for students of poverty from 28 to 27.5. Non-Academic State: Our students, like most students across our country, began learning from home virtually in March 2020. This continued through the beginning of the 2020-21 school year, with most students returning to in-person instruction on September 16, 2020. Currently, we have approximately 400 students learning in-person and 160 students learning virtually 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 structures in place to provide a quality education using virtual platforms, we recognize that equity issues have been exacerbated due to school closures. Additionally, we cannot replicate many of the conditions that make in-person learning effective. 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. We have also noticed an increase in parent referrals for IEPs and 504s as well as an increase in parent reports of anxiety and other behavioral concerns. The learning loss and social-emotional concerns arising due to school closures is our top concern. Our KPREP data from 2018-2019 indicates that math has only 59% P/D which lags behind reading where 63% of students are proficient or distinguished. Math P/D scores lagged behind reading P/D at all grade levels, while third grade novice in reading was an outlier at 22%. The gap for Hispanic and EL students continues to grow in both reading and math. Core instruction in science and social studies are areas of growth with only 42% and 57% P/D, respectively.

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 61.7% in 2017 to 62.8% in 2019. While this looks like a slight increase, when you go back 5 years it has been more significant, with 59.2% P/D in 2015. We are currently producing steady growth in reading, although we still have room for improvement, especially in third grade, indicating that primary reading instruction should be an area of focus. The previous two years in math have gone from 56% in 2017 to 59% in 2019. This increase is more significant when looked at over five years, with only 50.5% P/D in 2015. While we have made steady progress in math, our core math program is not meeting the needs of all students, and we would like to accelerate growth in this area. We have seen a steady downward trend in P/D in social studies from 74.4 in 2017 to 57.4 in 2019. The gap for EL students in math has decreased from 50.8 in 2017 to 39.2 in 2019, but has been extremely inconsistent over the past five years, with swings from from 63.4 in 2016 to 30.7 in 2018. We see the same inconsistent gap pattern in reading with a gap decrease from 64.7 in 2017 to 48.2 in 2019, but swings varying from 64.7 to 34.7 over five years. We have received an increase in parent requests for 504s, IEPs, and intervention support for anxiety, social skills, and other behavioral concerns. Therefore our significant areas for improvement are in primary reading, core math, core social studies, the gap for Hispanic and EL students, and social-emotional learning.

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](#)

One potential source of concern is KCWP 1, specifically in the area of curriculum. As curriculum revisions have not occurred in several years, teachers have determined that continued support in the area of standards-based curriculum development is needed, particularly in the areas of social studies and math. This year, we will be implementing new social studies curriculum frameworks, as developed by the district team last year. Another potential source of concern is KCWP 6, specifically in guaranteeing equitable access to core curriculum for diverse learners. We have determined that gaining greater understanding of culturally-responsive teaching practices will support them in closing the achievement gaps for Hispanic and EL learners along with achievement gaps for students in poverty. Also aligned to KCWP 6, teachers and parents have noted concerns in student character development and behavior. In response, social-emotional learning will be an area of focus for professional learning. In response to learning loss from in-person school closures, KCWP 5 is aligned with our focus on additional time for tier 2 interventions along with professional learning related to resources and strategies used to facilitate tier 2 interventions. Finally, as emergent literacy is an area of continued concern due to third grade reading scores consistently demonstrating relatively lower levels of proficiency and significantly higher percentages of students scoring novice, KCWP 2 will be utilized to increase teacher understanding of foundational literacy skills through the implementation of daily phonics instruction (K-2) and Successful Start strategies employed in Kindergarten and first grade.

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%.

*Writing proficiency is higher than any other content area, and we had a significant increase in writing achievement from 47.1% in 2017-18 to 69.3% in 2018-19.

*Reading and math 5-year trend lines are positive. We had a five-year increase in reading from 59.2% proficiency in 2014-15 to 62.8% proficiency in 2018-19 and a five-year increase in math from 50.5% proficiency in 2014-15 to 59% proficiency in 2018-19. *Our overall growth is high for cohort groups. Our students make a great deal of progress from 3rd to 5th grades, both in P/D and novice-reduction. In reading, our 2018-19 fifth grade cohort group increased in proficiency from 53% proficiency in third grade to 69% proficiency in fifth grade. They also demonstrated a novice reduction from 18% in third grade to 10% in fifth grade. *Math showed similar improvements with a third grade proficiency of 52% increasing to 66% in fifth grade and novice reduction from 13% in third grade to 5% in fifth grade. *We made significant progress in reducing the gap for students with disabilities. The gap in reading proficiency for students with disabilities decreased from 36.3 points in 2014-15 to 21.3 points in 2018-19, and the gap in math proficiency for students with disabilities decreased from 45.1 points in 2014-15 to 21.2 points in 2018-19.

Attachment Summary

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