

2017-2018 Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic_10172017_11:45

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

Cairo Elementary School
Brooke Elane Shappell
10694 Us Hwy 41 A
Henderson, Kentucky, 42420
United States of America

Last Modified: 01/12/2018
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	8

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

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

Data results are analyzed by multiple people on multiple occasions. It is a continuous process. The principal and instructional coach at Cairo meet with district office staff to review state data when it is released. These meetings have occurred once at the school and once at the district office. Cairo Elementary Site Based Council which includes 3 teacher representatives, 3 parent representatives, and the principal have meet on a monthly basis to review and analyze data results. There is a standing item on our agenda each month for student achievement data to be analyzed. As as staff, our data has been analyzed at a staff meeting once thus far, but in the next two months, we will be digging even deeper into these sets of data. In grade level meetings each week since the beginning of the year, the principal and instructional coach have met with grade level teams of teachers to analyze data. This data has included MAP testing data (individual, classroom, grade level, and whole school results), student work samples, classroom assessment data, district common assessment data, and KPREP results (individual and whole school results). As a school, we will continue these grade level meetings with teachers on a weekly basis throughout the school year.

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 non-duplicated gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2015 to 2016.
- 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 2016 schools year – a decrease from 92% in

2015.

-The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2017 from 276 in 2016.

Current Academic State: In reading, 55.9% of Cairo students tested scored proficient or distinguished in 2017 on KPREP. This was a decrease from the 59.2% of students who scored proficient or distinguished in reading according to 2016 KPREP assessment data. We fell short of meeting our delivery target of 69.8% for 2016-2017 in reading. In reading, we fell below the district percentage of 61.0% of students scoring proficient or distinguished in reading and we scored just above the state percentage of 54.3%. In math, 58.6% of Cairo students tested scored proficient or distinguished in 2017 on KPREP. This was a decrease from the 66.4% of students who scored proficient or distinguished in math according to 2016 KPREP assessment data. We fell short of meeting our delivery target of 71.3% for 2016-2017 in math. In math, we fell below the district percentage of 61.0% of students scoring proficient or distinguished in math and we scored above the state percentage of 49.1%. Our data shows that our school made gains in on-demand writing. In on-demand writing, 59.1% of Cairo students tested scored proficient or distinguished in 2017 on KPREP. This was an increase from the 54.0% of students who scored proficient or distinguished in on-demand according to 2016 KPREP assessment data. We met our delivery target of 53.6% for 2016-2017 in on-demand writing. In on-demand writing, we scored above district percentage of 58.4% of students scoring proficient or distinguished in on-demand writing and we scored above the state percentage of 45.9%. In reading, we did not meet our delivery targets for our GAP groups. For students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, 38.8% of students scored proficient or distinguished in reading according to 2017 KPREP data. Our deliver target for free and reduced lunch students for reading was 62.1%. For students who qualify as having a disability, 28.6% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in reading and our delivery target was 49.8% for 2017. In our non-duplicated GAP group for reading, 40.4% of students scored proficient or distinguished and our delivery target was 62.6%. In math, we did not meet our delivery targets for our GAP groups. For students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, 38.8% of students scored proficient or distinguished in math according to 2017 KPREP data. Our deliver target for free and reduced lunch students for math was 62.8%. For students who qualify as having a disability, 38.1% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in math and our delivery target was 46.7% for 2017. In our non-duplicated GAP group for math, 42.7% of students scored proficient or distinguished and our delivery target was 63.5%. In on-demand writing, we met our delivery targets for our GAP groups. For students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, 52.4% of students scored proficient or distinguished in on-demand writing according to 2017 KPREP data. Our deliver target for free and reduced lunch students for on-demand writing was 48.3%. In our non-duplicated GAP group for on-demand writing, 50.0% of students scored proficient or distinguished and our delivery target was 48.0%. Teacher attendance: Teacher attendance rate for the 2016-2017 school year was 95.81% which was a decrease of 0.51% from the 2015-2016 attendance rate of 96.32%. Behavior Referrals: The number of behavior referrals has decreased from 112 in 2015-2016 to 110 in 2016-2017.

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

Reading: Decrease of 3.3% of all students who scored proficient or distinguished in reading from spring 2016 to spring 2017 according to KPREP results. 44.1% of all students scored below

proficiency in reading in KPREP in 2017. 61.2 % of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch scored below proficiency in reading according to 2017 KPREP results. 71.4% of students who qualify as having a disability scored below proficiency in reading according to 2017 KPREP results. In our non-duplicated GAP group, 59.6% of students scored below proficiency in reading according to 2017 KPREP results. Math: Decrease of 7.8% of all students who scored proficient or distinguished in math from spring 2016 to spring 2017 according to KPREP results. 41.4% of all students scored below proficiency in math in KPREP in 2017. 61.2 % of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch scored below proficiency in math according to 2017 KPREP results. 61.9% of students who qualify as having a disability scored below proficiency in math according to 2017 KPREP results. In our non-duplicated GAP group, 57.3% of students scored below proficiency in math according to 2017 KPREP results. Non-Academic Data Points: Staff attendance rate has slightly decreased from 96.32% in 2015-2016 to 95.81% in 2016-2017.

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?

Areas of academic concern fall in both reading and math. Our data shows a decline in both reading and math scores over the past two academic years. Reading: Students who scored proficient or distinguished in reading 2014-2015 was 58.9%. Students who scored proficient or distinguished in reading in 2015-2016 was 59.2%. Student who scored proficient or distinguished in reading in 2016-2017 was 55.9%. For reading GAP groups: 43.2% of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch scored proficient or distinguished in 2014-2015. In 2015-2016, 41.8% scored proficient or distinguished. And, in 2016-2017, 38.8% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in reading. 18.8% of students who qualify as having a disability scored proficient or distinguished in reading in 2014-2015. In 2015-2016, 25.0% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in reading. And, in 2016-2017, 28.6% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in reading. 42.3% of students who fell into our non-duplicated GAP group scored proficient or distinguished in reading in 2014-2015. In 2015-2016, 42.9% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in reading. And, in 2016-2017, 40.4% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in reading. Math: Students who scored proficient or distinguished in math 2014-2015 was 59.5%. Students who scored proficient or distinguished in math in 2015-2016 was 66.4%. Students who scored proficient or distinguished in math in 2016-2017 was 58.6%. For math GAP groups: 47.3% of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch scored proficient or distinguished in 2014-2015. In 2015-2016, 57.0% scored proficient or distinguished. And, in 2016-2017, 38.8% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in math. 18.8% of students who qualify as having a disability scored proficient or distinguished in math in 2014-2015. In 2015-2016, 31.3% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in math. And, in 2016-2017, 38.1% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in math. 46.2% of students who fell into our non-duplicated GAP group scored proficient or distinguished in math in 2014-2015. In 2015-2016, 56.0% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in math. And, in 2016-2017, 42.7% of these students scored proficient or distinguished in math.

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

school improvement strategies outlined below:

[1- Deployment of Standards](#)

[2- Delivery of Instruction](#)

[3- Assessment Literacy](#)

[4- Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results](#)

[5- Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus](#)

[6- Establish a Learning Culture and Environment](#)

Cairo Elementary will focus on Delivery of Instruction, Reviewing, Analyzing, and Applying Data Results, and Designing, Aligning, and Delivering Support Processes with Sub-group Focus. This year, we will focus our resources and efforts on ensuring that our teachers use direct/explicit instruction in reading and math. Our instructional coach has and will continue to model what good direct/explicit instruction looks like in the classroom setting. Teachers will also observe their peers and have formative conversations about direct/explicit instruction. The principal and instructional coach will conduct walkthroughs and give formative feedback on best practices in math and reading instruction. Implementation of these best practices will be monitored by the principal through walkthroughs and evaluation observations. Through individual conversations with teachers, grade level meetings with grade level teaching teams, and in staff meetings, we will continue to review and analyze our data results to make decisions about next steps for our students and school improvement for our school. Teachers will bring student work and assessment data to grade level meetings to analyze along with the principal and instructional coach. Feedback will be given to help improve instruction in both reading and math. As grade level teams and in staff meetings, we will continue to analyze assessment data for students in our sub-groups. Instruction will be designed for these students that is aligned with their individual need and support processes will be put into place to improve achievement of students who fall in our sub-groups.

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%.

From 2014 - 2017, the percentage of students who have scored proficient or distinguished in on-demand writing has improved from 33.7% in 2014 to 59.1% in 2017. This is an increase of 25.4%. We have consistently shown gains in on-demand writing over the past four years. Last year, we met our delivery target in on-demand writing. We exceed the target of 53.6% of students scoring proficient or distinguished as 59.1% of our students scored at or above proficiency. In our GAP groups, we also met our targets for both students qualifying for free and reduced lunch and for students who fell in our non-duplicated GAP group. For students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, 52.4% scored proficient or distinguished in 2016-2017 and our target was 48.3%. For students who fell in the non-duplicated GAP group, 50.0% scored proficient or distinguished in 2016-2017 and our target was 48.0%. From 2014 - 2017, the percentage of students who have scored proficient or distinguished in social studies has improved from 61.0 in 2014 to 81.8% in 2017. This is an increase of 20.8%. Last year, we met our delivery target in social studies. We exceeded the target of 72.7% of students scoring proficient or distinguished as 81.8% of our students scored at or above proficiency. In our GAP groups, we also met our target for students qualifying for free and reduced lunch. For students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, 66.7% scored proficient or distinguished in 2016-2017 and our target was 65.9%. Behavior referral data showed a decrease in the number of behavior referrals from 112 in 2015-2016 to 110 in 2016-2017.

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