



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for LaGrange Elementary

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

LaGrange Elementary School

Heather Thomas

500 West Jefferson St
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	7
Priorities/Concerns	9
Trends	11
Potential Source of Problem	12
Strengths/Leverages	14

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?

Attendance Data Participants: School Principal, Assistant Principal, Intervention Specialist, Counselors, Attendance Clerk, Family Resource Director, District Student Services Director Frequency: Weekly Documentation: Running Record of Student total absences and tardies, Tiered intervention folders listing interventions in place and student progress. Process used: Students identified after they have missed 3 days of school. School letter goes home after 3 unexcused absences or tardies. School-based interventions initiated. Second school letter goes home 6 unexcused absences or tardies. Review of interventions. District letter goes home following the 6 unexcused absences or tardies. Referral to County Attorney. Behavioral Data Participants: School Principal, Assistant Principal, Intervention Specialist, Counselors, School Psychologist, District Mental Health Consultant Frequency: Weekly Documentation: Running Record of Students discussed, Tiered intervention folders identifying interventions and student progress, Collection of Request for Office Behavioral Assistance forms, Data from Infinite Campus Process Used: Once a student receives three Requests for Office Behavioral Assistance forms, student concerns are discussed. If it is believed that the student's behavior warrants Tier II interventions, student begins the BRIDGE process which is specific to behavior interventions. Progress with interventions is discussed weekly. Academic Intervention Data Participants: Intervention Specialist, School Psychologist, Reading Recovery teachers, Math Intervention Specialist, Counselors, Speech/ Language Pathologist, PLC teachers per grade Frequency: Team meets weekly with each grade/ each PLC meets once every 6 weeks Documentation: Student's Action Plan, Progress Monitoring Data, Instructional Records for Tier 2 and Tier 3, Notes collected during the meeting by the Intervention Specialist and on student's Action Plan Process Used: All students take the Universal Screener, NWEA MAP Assessment, three times a year. From this, students below the 10th percentile are given an additional diagnostic screener to see what deficits they have and if they should be placed in a Tier 3 intervention group. Teachers use their Tier 1 data as well to confirm the placement of Tier 3 students. To choose Tier 2 students, the PLC meets to analyze Tier 1 data and MAP data. Any student below the 25th percentile and is struggling on the formative assessments is chosen for placement in Tier 2. The PLC meets every Thursday to discuss patterns in data and to monitor the progress of their Tier 2 students. The Academic Intervention Team meets every 6 weeks with the PLC team to monitor the progress of the Tier 3 students. MAP Data

Participants: School Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Intervention Specialist, Math Intervention Teacher, Library Media Specialist, Individual PLC members Frequency: 4 times per year (Spring scores from previous year, Fall, Winter, Spring) Documentation: Instructional Leadership Team Meeting Minutes; Faculty Conference Slides; Individual PLC team minutes Process Used: Spring MAP scores are used for student placement in classes. Students are grouped in like-scored cohorts so that teachers have manageable groups for differentiation purposes. Comparison of Spring to Fall scores also occurs to determine summer slide. Fall MAP scores are used to determine Tier Intervention groups and also enrichment groups. With a change in MAP norms additional professional learning is necessary. The Administrative team will view training videos from Leslie Robertson, District MAP Coordinator. Within the PLC with an administrator on each team, there will be additional training videos and graphic organizers to analyze the data. Winter MAP is used to determine student progress from baseline (fall) and identify any gaps that might be occurring. Spring MAP is used to identify final “push” areas and to evaluate CORE instruction for that year. KPREP Data: Due to Covid and school closures, there will be no KPREP data to analyze for the 19-20 school year.

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.

KPREP Data: Due to Covid and school closures, there will be no KPREP data to analyze for the 19-20 school year. Data included is from the 18-19 school year.
18/19 -Reading and math proficiency on KPREP Total Proficiency- La Grange 63.2
Reading proficiency- La Grange 64.4 Math proficiency- La Grange 61.9 18/19
-Separate Academic Indicators in science, social studies and on-demand writing on KPREP Separate Academic Indicators overall score- La Grange 63.1 Science score- La Grange 47.6 Social Studies- La Grange 65.1 Writing- La Grange 76.5 18/19 Growth scores on KPREP Total growth- La Grange 60.4 Reading- La Grange 58.4 Math- La Grange 59.7 EL - 95.8
MAP Data: Due to Covid and school closures, there will be no spring MAP data to analyze for the 19-20 school year. All data is based on 20-21 fall data. The data is being reviewed to determine if outliers or the impact of Covid had an overall impact on grade level dropping below the national norm.
· K – Math School is 7.5 points higher than the national norm
· K – Reading School is 6.8 points higher than the national norm
· 1 – Math School is 3.5 points lower than the national norm
· 1 – Reading School is 2.7 points lower than the national norm
· 2 – Math School is 1.3 points higher than the national norm
· 2 – Reading School is .6 points lower than the national norm
· 3 – Math School is 4.7 points lower than the national norm
· 3 – Reading School is 3.7 points lower than the national norm
· 4 –

Math School is 3.9 points lower than the national norm · 4 – Reading School is 2.8 points lower than the national norm · 5 – Math School is 5.8 points lower than the national norm · 5 – Reading School is 3.8 points lower than the national norm Non-Academic Current State: Due to Covid and school closures, there will be no data to analyze for the 19-20 school year. All data is dated prior to 19-20. -Student Attendance increased from 95.9% for 16-17 to 96.1% for the 17-18 and the 18-19 school year. - According to data maintained on Infinite Campus, 289 behavior events for 2018-19 school year compared to 152 behavior events for 2017-18 school year. Physical Aggression most common event type from year to year. 2017-18 27 students (6% of total school population) exhibited physical aggression 53 times. 2018-19 31 students (7% of total school population) exhibited physical aggression 127 times. Of the 31 students involved in physical aggression for the 2018-19 school year, 4 are receiving Tiered Interventions, 8 moved from Tiered Interventions and were Identified for Special Education Services during 18-19 school year, and 4 had already been receiving services for Emotional Behavior Disorder. The 2020 Impact survey didn't have a question specifically addressing clearly established and followed rules of conduct, however, the results supported positive improvements in terms of managing student behavior. Based on the responses from 49 staff members, 80% of the staff responded favorably to leadership developing rules to facilitate learning and 69% favorably feel school administrators support teachers' classroom management efforts. Overall, 96% of the staff responded favorably to the safety of our school environment However, 82% of staff believe that student behavior disrupts instruction.

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.

KPREP Data: Due to Covid and school closures, there will be no KPREP data to analyze for the 19-20 school year. All data is dated prior to 19-20. Writing The GAP between Disabled and non-disabled in the area of writing has increased from 22.7% 18/19 to 61.1% 18/19. The GAP between Poverty and non-poverty in the area of writing has increased from 2.7% 17/18 to 9.6 18/19. SS Percentage of students scoring novice continues to increase. 17/18 14.9% novice to 18/19 16.2% novice. The GAP between disabled students and non disabled in the area of social studies has increased from 33.9 17/18 to 41.4% 18/19. Science Proficiency rate (A, P, D) in science decreased from 52.4% 17/18 to 47.6% 18/19 Percentage of students scoring Novice in science has increased from 17.8% in 17/18 to 29.8% 18/19 Overall school score in science has decreased from 52% 17/18 to 47% 18/19 Reading Achievement Gaps with Hispanic students on KPREP test in reading are widening over time with white students: 18.9 17/18 to 20.3 18/19 Achievement GAPS with Disabled students on KPREP test in reading has decreased from 39.3% to 37.6 % but still remains wide 68% of gap students scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners. Math Math proficiency for all students decreased from 64.3% 17/18 to 61.9% 18/19 GAPS between Hispanic students and non Hispanic has increased from 7 pts 17/18 to 12.5 pts 18/19. Non-academic data Behavior As of March 12, 2020, for the 2019-20 school year, there were 267 total behavior events logged into Infinite campus. This is a decrease of 22 total events from 2018-19, however, the timeframe for data collection does not correlate. Non-Traditional Instruction began on March 16th, discontinuing face-to-face instruction by 9 weeks and ending behavior data collection. Physical Aggression continues to be the most common event type (39%) of all events for 2019-20. However, Disruptive Behavior has had a noticeable upswing (22%) which correlates with 82% of staff perception (KY - TELL-Like) that student behavior disrupts instruction. 6% of the student population exhibited physical aggression 105 times. Of the 31 students involved in physical aggression for the 2019-20 school year, 13 have been identified for Specially Designed Instruction, 4 are Tier III for

behavior, 5 are Tier II and the remaining 9 are Tier I students who may have had an isolated incidence of aggressive behavior.

Trends

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

Academic - KPREP needs for improvement Reading - Proficiency rate for 5th grade showed a significant increase 49% 17/18 to 55% 18/19. Grades 3 & 4 remained stagnant with no significant change. Reading - Significant reductions in the number of students scoring Novice for grades 3 & 5. Grade 4 remained stagnant in the number of students scoring Novice. Math - Proficiency rate for 4th grade showed a positive trend 33% 17/18 to 43.6%. 3rd grade remained stagnant and 5th grade had a decline in the percentage of students scoring proficient/distinguished 50% 17/18 to 42.6 in 18/19. Math - Significant increase in the percentage of students scoring Novice for grades 3 (17/18 19%; 18/19 26.9%) and 5 (17/18 - 13.5%; 18/19 - 19.1). Science - Overall score (NAPD) dropped from 52% (17/18) to 47.6% (18/19). The overall percentage of students scoring Novice increased from 17.8% in 17/18 to 29.8% 18/19. Comparing individual student scores, those students who were “on the bubble” of increasing performance rating (N - A or A - P) did not improve. “Bubble” students are not growing. MAP needs for improvement Spring 2019 MAP Reading and Math average RIT scores showed a widening gap from the National Norm for grades 2 - 5. Behavior Needs for Improvement As of March 12, 2020, for the 2019-20 school year, there were 267 total behavior events logged into Infinite campus. This is a decrease of 22 total events from 2018-19, however, the timeframe for data collection does not correlate. Non-Traditional Instruction began on March 16th, discontinuing face-to-face instruction by 9 weeks and ending behavior data collection. Physical Aggression continues to be the most common event type (39%) of all events for 2019-20. However, Disruptive Behavior has had a noticeable upswing (22%) which correlates with 82% of staff perception (KY - TELL-Like) that student behavior disrupts instruction. 6% of the student population exhibited physical aggression 105 times. Of the 31 students involved in physical aggression for the 2019-20 school year, 13 have been identified for Specially Designed Instruction, 4 are Tier III for behavior, 5 are Tier II and the remaining 9 are Tier I students who may have had an isolated incidence of aggressive behavior.

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](#)

KCWP 2 Data indicates a continued need to design and deliver Tier I and Tier II instruction that meets the needs of all students, particularly those identified in the GAP group. Currently, grade level PLCs have identified essential standards in ELA and Mathematics, created formative and summative assessments linked directly to the standards, as well as created kid-friendly "I can" statements to inform students of their learning. Grade level PLCs meet weekly to analyze data and determine next steps in instruction, intervention and enrichment. Processes are in place to measure teacher effectiveness through the monitoring of student growth on the universal screener administered three times per year. In addition, teachers are measured through a certified evaluation based on the Danielson Framework and building walkthroughs designed to focus on school wide goals. Many efforts have been placed on strengthening core instruction, however there is much work to be done in order to prepare students for middle school and beyond. Some areas needing growth are increasing systems of collaboration, student responsibility for their learning, monitoring of learning before, during, and after instruction, and ensuring cognitive engagement. For the 20-21 school year, we have intentionally focused on collaboration with Special Education and EL teachers pushing into classrooms to co-teach and address the needs of special education and English Language Learners to help meet the Tier I educational needs of all students. Some grade levels have systems in place that require intentional student accountability, however this is not consistent among all grades. PLCs need to focus on identifying more ways for students to take responsibility for their own learning, making this a fluid process building wide. PLCs have many formative and summative assessments in place for both ELA and Mathematics. However, a more intentional focus of monitoring before instruction will provide teachers with the data necessary to differentiate their instructional practices to meet the needs of all students. Furthermore, ongoing monitoring during and after instruction will be instrumental

in identifying students needing intervention, enrichment, and instructional next steps. Ensuring cognitive engagement has been a priority through school wide professional learning in Explicit Instruction, as well as instructional best practices for students living in poverty. All teachers are incorporating engagement strategies to meet the needs of all their learners. Analysis of ABRI data, professional learning on feedback and further observations with ABRI will be key in targeting tier I behavior goals. School counselors and PLCs will continue to focus on identifying strategies to increase student engagement, therefore impacting student achievement through behavior. Strengthening core instruction by increasing systems of collaboration, encouraging student responsibility for their learning, intentional monitoring of learning before, during, and after instruction, and ensuring cognitive engagement will lead to our desired outcomes of closing the achievement gap between white students and those students identified in the GAP group. Intentional focus in these areas will increase the number of students scoring proficient/distinguished as measured by the K-PREP, and decrease the number of students scoring novice.

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%.

MAP Data: Due to Covid and school closures, there will be no spring MAP data to analyze for the 19-20 school year. All data is based on 20-21 fall data. The data is being reviewed to determine if outliers or the impact of Covid had an overall impact on grade level dropping below the national norm. -MAP Reading Mean RIT averages compared to the national Mean RIT K through 5th grade K is 6.8 points higher than the national norm 1st grade is 2.7 points lower than the national norm 2nd grade is .6 points lower than the national norm 3rd grade is 3.7 points lower than the national norm 4th grade is 2.8 points lower than the national norm 5th grade is 3.8 points lower than the national norm -MAP Math Mean RIT averages compared to the national Mean RIT K through 5th grade Kindergarten is 7.5 points higher than the national norm 1st grade is 3.5 points lower than the national norm 2nd grade is 1.3 points higher than the national norm 3rd grade is 4.7 points lower than the national norm 4th grade is 3.9 points lower than the national norm 5th grade is 5.8 points lower than the national norm

Attachment Summary

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