

**Veterans Park Elementary Phase II: The Needs Assessment School
Diagnostic_12292017_07:46**

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

Veterans Park Elementary School

Molly Dabney
4351 Clearwater Way
Lexington, Kentucky, 40515
United States of America

Last Modified: 01/23/2018

Status: Open

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?

Veterans Park Elementary has a leadership team that meets twice a month to review data and building needs that are then communicated with the staff. This team is made up of the following: Molly Dabney, Principal; Janet Bertrand, PGES Coach; Shannon Brehm, Counselor; Julie Pearman, 5th Grade; Melissa Hauke, 4th Grade; Missy Zepeda, 3rd Grade; Toni Jones, 2nd Grade; Kristen Dixon, 1st Grade; Erin Rowe, Kindergarten; Johnnie Bishop, Special Area; Jessica Ault, Librarian; Molly Williams, Special Education; The leadership team meets on regular basis on the first and third Tuesday morning of the month before school starts. During these meetings we document everything in our meeting minutes which is housed in our school wide google handbook. The team met for a full day release day and reviewed the following sources of data: 2016-2017 TELL Survey, PTA SOE Parent Survey Fall 2017, Brigance Results 2017, KPREP Data (Gap & Growth) for 2016-2017 school year as well as trends over the past four years, School Report Card, and MAP Data. During our meeting we used all of this data to answer questions using the key Core Work Process Guiding Questions. These KCWP allowed for us to look at the 6 researched-based approaches and then utilize the Likert Score for each. This then allowed for us to determine our leverages and concerns at Veterans Park Elementary.

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.

47.6% of non-duplicated gap group students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Reading in 2017. 26.6% of non-duplicated gap group students scored novice on KPREP Reading in 2017. 46.1% of non-duplicated gap group students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Math in 2017. 20.3% of non-duplicated gap group students scored novice on KPREP Math in 2017. The percent of students scoring proficient or distinguished on KPREP Reading dropped 9% points from 2016 to 2017 (80.9-71.9) The percent of students scoring proficient or distinguished on KRPEP Math dropped 2.9% points from 2016 to 2017 (76.4-73.5) Students scoring novice in reading in a non-duplicated gap group in reading increased 6.8% from 2016 to 2017. Students scoring novice in math in a non-duplicated gap group in math increased 3.4% from 2016 to 2017. The number of student enrolled in Veterans Park Elementary increased from 625 students in 2015-2016 to 785 student in 2016-2017. Which was a 25% increase in student population.

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.

27.3% of student with a disability scored Novice on KPREP testing in reading as opposed to just 11% of students without disabilities scoring Novice. 22.7% of students with a disability scored Novice on KPREP testing in math as opposed to just 16% of student without disabilities scoring Novice. 51.7% of students in non-duplicated gap groups scored below proficiency on KPREP in reading in 2017. 53.9% of students in non-duplicated gap groups scored below proficiency on KPREP in math in 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?

When looking at reading data for the past four years there is a significant decline in the percent of students scoring proficient and distinguished. In 2014 84.8% were proficient/distinguished, in 2015 81.4% were proficient/distinguished, in 2016 80.9% were proficient/distinguished and then last year 71.9% were proficient/distinguished. The same thing has happened in math over the past three years. In 2015, 83.9% of students were proficient/distinguished then in 2016 only 76.4% of students were proficient/distinguished and then this last year only 73.5% of student scored proficient/distinguished in math. Both of this declines have been steady over time and even though we increased in student population by 150 students this past year the decline had already started.

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](#)

When working with the leadership team it was determined that our two areas of concern at Veterans Park Elementary are #4 - Reviewing, Analyzing and Applying Data Results as well as #3 Design and Deliver Assessment in Literacy. When working through our SWOT analysis we were very critical of ourselves and that we do collect a lot of data on students through MAP, FAST, Formative and Summative Assessments but sometimes this data is used to help drive our instruction or talk as a team about individual student need in their tiered instruction. VPE is aware that our current MTSS model is not necessarily moving kids or making the necessary changes needed to positively effect student learning. Therefore, we are working on revamping the system to better communicate data and make time to analyze this data to drive our instruction.

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%.

The leadership team felt that we did have a major strength/leverage with establishing a learning culture and environment. When reflecting upon our TELL survey from 2015 and 2017 the data stays very consistent. One of the most telling pieces of data is the question - "Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn." in 2015 87.5% of the staff agreed with that statement and in 2017, 91.4% of the staff agreed. This is evident of the school culture and climate. It was stated that our strengths are the relationship we have as colleagues and with our students, the high expectations set for students and that the teachers have a strong work ethic. The team also determined that the designing and deployment of the standards was a strength/leverage. We currently have two school wide reading and math programs (Eureka Math, Wonders Reading) that allow for consistency across the building. The staff has also worked hard the past year on creating aligned long range plans that are vertical across grade levels.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Understanding Continuous Improvement: Goals, Objectives, Strategies and Activities

Rationale: The development of goals and objectives to be obtained through strategies and activities is an essential component of executing a continuous improvement plan. In short, the Needs Assessment completed during Phase II expresses the school or district's CURRENT STATE, while goals, objectives, strategies and activities should succinctly plot the school or district's course to their DESIRED STATE. Here are the operational definitions of each:

Goal: Long-term target based on Kentucky Board of Education Goals. Schools may supplement with individual or district goals.

Objective: Short-term target to be attained by the end of the current school year.

Strategy: Research-based approach based on the 6 Key Core Work Processes designed to systematically address the process, practice or condition that the school/district will focus its efforts upon in order to reach its goals/objectives.

Activity: The actionable steps used to deploy the chosen strategy.

Key Core Work Processes: A series of processes that involve the majority of an organization's workforce and relate to its core competencies. These are the factors that determine an organization's success and help it prioritize areas for growth.

Guidelines for Building an Improvement Plan

- There are 5 required District Goals: Proficiency, Gap, Graduation rate, Growth, and Transition readiness.
- There are 4 required school-level goals:
For elementary/middle school: Proficiency, Gap, Growth, and Transition readiness.
For high school: Proficiency, Gap, Graduation rate, and Transition readiness.
- There can be multiple objectives for each goal.
- There can be multiple strategies for each objective.
- There can be multiple activities for each strategy.

1: Proficiency

State your **Proficiency** Goal

Goal 1: Proficiency: By 2020, the school will increase the combined (reading and math) percentage of proficient/distinguished students to 86.4%					
<p>Which Strategy will the school/district use to address this goal? <i>(The Strategy can be based upon the six Key Core Work Processes listed below or another research-based approach. Provide justification and/or attach evidence for why the strategy was chosen.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 		<p>Which Activities will the school/district deploy based on the strategy or strategies chosen? <i>(The links to the Key Core Work Processes activity bank below may be a helpful resource. Provide a brief explanation or justification for the activity.)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KCWP1: Design and Deploy Standards - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP2: Design and Deliver Instruction - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP5: Design, Align and Deliver Support - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment - Continuous Improvement Activities 		<p>Identify the timeline for the activity or activities, the person(s) responsible for ensuring the fidelity of the activity or activities, and necessary funding to execute the activity or activities.</p>	
Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
<p>Objective 1: By May 2018, 75.9% of elementary student will score at or above proficiency in reading.</p>	<p>Strategy-KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards</p> <p>Strategy-KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy</p>	<p>Activity-Essential & Enduring Standards Teachers meet weekly in grade level PLC teams to unpack essential standards and revise learning targets connected to KCSA including formative and summative assessment to determine the impact of teaching and learning.</p>	<p>Lesson Plans Learning Targets Formative Assessments</p>	<p>Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers School Leadership</p>	<p>\$0</p>
		<p>Activity-Tier II Wednesday & Thursdays PLC teams meet regularly with intervention team to analyze formative assessments and to plan additional instructional strategies to determine mastery of common core standards.</p>	<p>Formative Assessments</p>	<p>On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers</p>	<p>\$0</p>
<p>Objective 2: By May 2018, 80.4% of elementary student will score at or above proficiency in math.</p>	<p>Strategy-KCWP 4: Review, Analyze & Apply Data</p>	<p>Activity- Common Assessment Review PLC teams will meet to review common assessment data and then determine gaps in learning. Re-teaching, and small intervention groups to meet the needs of individual students will address these gaps.</p>	<p>Formative/Summative Assessments</p>	<p>Regular Education Special Education ELL Teacher Intervention Teachers</p>	<p>\$0</p>
		<p>Activity- Teacher Professional Development Throughout the year, staff will have embedded professional learning to help grow their math instruction. This will take place in PLC and/or staff meetings and teachers, school leadership and district personnel will work</p>	<p>Professional Growth Plans Formative Assessments</p>	<p>On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers</p>	<p>\$0</p>

Goal 1: Proficiency: By 2020, the school will increase the combined (reading and math) percentage of proficient/distinguished students to 86.4%					
		collaboratively to build understanding and knowledge or research based learning.		Intervention Teachers School Leadership	

2: Gap

State your **Gap** Goal

Goal 2: Gap: Increase the average combined reading and math proficiency rates for all students in the Gap Group (non-duplicated) to 52.4% in 2019.

Which **Strategy** will the school/district use to address this goal? (*The Strategy can be based upon the six Key Core Work Processes listed below or another research-based approach. Provide justification and/or attach evidence for why the strategy was chosen.*)

- [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](#)

Which **Activities** will the school/district deploy based on the strategy or strategies chosen? (*The links to the Key Core Work Processes activity bank below may be a helpful resource. Provide a brief explanation or justification for the activity.*)

- [KCWP1: Design and Deploy Standards - Continuous Improvement Activities](#)
- [KCWP2: Design and Deliver Instruction - Continuous Improvement Activities](#)
- [KCWP3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy - Continuous Improvement Activities](#)
- [KCWP4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data - Continuous Improvement Activities](#)
- [KCWP5: Design, Align and Deliver Support - Continuous Improvement Activities](#)
- [KCWP6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment - Continuous Improvement Activities](#)

Identify the timeline for the activity or activities, the person(s) responsible for ensuring the fidelity of the activity or activities, and necessary funding to execute the activity or activities.

Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: By May 2018, 53.0% of non-duplicated gap students will score at or above proficiency in reading.	Strategy-KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction Strategy-KCWP 4: Review, Analyze & Apply Data	Activity-Tier III Intervention Team RTI team and grade level teachers meet regularly to analyze data, determine research based intervention strategies and assess the effectiveness of the intervention plan as evidenced by formative and summative data.	Tier II & III plans Progress Monitoring Plans Formative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education Intervention Teaches School Leadership	\$0
		Activity-Read to Achieve Grant K-3 students who need tier III reading instruction will receive research based reading instruction using the Leveled Literacy Intervention system.	Student Intervention plans MAP/FAST Data Guided Reading Assessment	RTA Grant Teacher	KY RTA Grant / VPE matches \$50,000
		Activity-PLC Teams, PSP & IEP Goals Regular education, ELL and special education teachers will work collaboratively to write PSP and IEP goals to align with common core standards and data to support the individual needs of students.	IEP & PSP Plans Formative/Summative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers School Leadership	\$0

Goal 2: Gap: Increase the average combined reading and math proficiency rates for all students in the Gap Group (non-duplicated) to 52.4% in 2019.					
Objective 2: By May 2018, 51.3% of non-duplicated gap students will score at or above proficiency in math.	Strategy-KCWP 4: Design, Align and Deliver Support Strategy-KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment	Activity- Teacher Professional Development Throughout the year, staff will have embedded professional learning to help grow their math instruction. This will take place in PLC and/or staff meetings and teachers, school leadership and district personnel will work collaboratively to build understanding and knowledge or research based learning.	Professional Growth Plans Formative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers School Leadership	\$0
		Activity-Attendance The guidance counselor, attendance clerk and principal will work collaboratively with parents and district personnel to remove barriers and to develop plans for chronic absences and tardies.	Student Action Plans Attendance Reports	Guidance Counselor Attendance Clerk Principal DPP	\$0
		Activity-PBIS Teachers and school leadership will continue to work collaboratively to revise its behavior management plan (common expectations, rules and procedures) including its logical consequences as evidenced by the PBIS model.	PBIS Plan Student Referrals	January 2018- September 2018 All Stakeholders	\$0

3: Growth

State your **Growth** Goal

Goal 3: Growth: Increase the average combined reading and math growth in grades 3 – 5 from 77.9% to 80% by 2020.					
<p>Which Strategy will the school/district use to address this goal? (<i>The Strategy can be based upon the six Key Core Work Processes listed below or another research-based approach. Provide justification and/or attach evidence for why the strategy was chosen.</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 		<p>Which Activities will the school/district deploy based on the strategy or strategies chosen? (<i>The links to the Key Core Work Processes activity bank below may be a helpful resource. Provide a brief explanation or justification for the activity.</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KCWP1: Design and Deploy Standards - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP2: Design and Deliver Instruction - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP5: Design, Align and Deliver Support - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment - Continuous Improvement Activities 		<p>Identify the timeline for the activity or activities, the person(s) responsible for ensuring the fidelity of the activity or activities, and necessary funding to execute the activity or activities.</p>	
Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: Veterans Park Elementary School will increase combined K-PREP reading typical growth for all students from 72.7% in 2016-17 to 75% in 2017-18.	Strategy-KCWP 4: Review, Analyze & Apply Data	<p>Activity-Formative Assessment Data Review PLC teams, intervention teachers, instructional support staff and school leadership will continually review formative assessment data to make certain Tier II and Tier III interventions are targeted on standards based instruction and interventions meet the changing individual needs of the student over time.</p>	Formative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers School Leadership	\$0
		<p>Activity-Balanced Assessment System Teachers and support staff will build their knowledge and understanding of methods to design and utilize project based learning for students to communicate their understanding and mastery of common core standards.</p>	Project Based Learning	On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers School Leadership	\$0
Objective 2:		Activity-Gifted & Talented	Formative/Summative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education	\$0

Goal 3: Growth: Increase the average combined reading and math growth in grades 3 – 5 from 77.9% to 80% by 2020.					
Veterans Park Elementary School will increase combined K-PREP math typical growth for all students from 82.9% in 2016-17 to 85% in 2017-18.		Teachers will work collaboratively with the G/T coordinator to develop differentiated instruction to extend student learning for students who have already mastered grade level core content while increasing rigor and student engagement.		Special Education ELL Teachers Gifted/Talented Coordinator	
		Activity- Teacher Professional Development Throughout the year, staff will have embedded professional learning to help grow their math instruction. This will take place in PLC and/or staff meetings and teachers, school leadership and district personnel will work collaboratively to build understanding and knowledge or research based learning.	Professional Growth Plans Formative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers School Leadership	\$0

4: Transition readiness

State your **Transition readiness Goal**

Goal 4: Proficiency: By 2020, the school will increase the combined (reading and math) percentage of projected ACT college readiness to 72.5%					
<p>Which Strategy will the school/district use to address this goal? (<i>The Strategy can be based upon the six Key Core Work Processes listed below or another research-based approach. Provide justification and/or attach evidence for why the strategy was chosen.</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 		<p>Which Activities will the school/district deploy based on the strategy or strategies chosen? (<i>The links to the Key Core Work Processes activity bank below may be a helpful resource. Provide a brief explanation or justification for the activity.</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KCWP1: Design and Deploy Standards - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP2: Design and Deliver Instruction - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP5: Design, Align and Deliver Support - Continuous Improvement Activities KCWP6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment - Continuous Improvement Activities 		<p>Identify the timeline for the activity or activities, the person(s) responsible for ensuring the fidelity of the activity or activities, and necessary funding to execute the activity or activities.</p>	
Objective	Strategy	Activities to deploy strategy	Measure of Success	Progress Monitoring Date & Notes	Funding
Objective 1: By May 2018, 67.6% of 5 th grade student will have a projected score of being on-track for a 24 ACT as measured by MAP reading.	Strategy-KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards Strategy-KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy	Activity-Essential & Enduring Standards Teachers meet weekly in grade level PLC teams to unpack essential standards and revise learning targets connected to KCSA including formative and summative assessment to determine the impact of teaching and learning.	Lesson Plans Learning Targets Formative Assessments	Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers School Leadership	\$0
		Activity-Tier II Wednesday & Thursdays PLC teams meet regularly with intervention team to analyze formative assessments and to plan additional instructional strategies to determine mastery of common core standards.	Formative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education Special Education ELL Teachers	\$0
Objective 2: By May 2018, 77.4% of 5 th grade student will have a projected score of being on-track for a 24 ACT as measured by MAP math	Strategy-KCWP 4: Review, Analyze & Apply Data	Activity- Common Assessment Review PLC teams will meet to review common assessment data and then determine gaps in learning. Re-teaching, and small intervention groups to meet the needs of individual students will address these gaps.	Formative/Summative Assessments	Regular Education Special Education ELL Teacher Intervention Teachers	\$0
		Activity-Formative Assessment Data Review PLC teams, intervention teachers, instructional support staff and school leadership will continually review formative assessment data to make	Formative Assessments	On-Going Regular Education Special Education	\$0

Goal 4: Proficiency: By 2020, the school will increase the combined (reading and math) percentage of projected ACT college readiness to 72.5%					
		certain Tier II and Tier III interventions are targeted on standards based instruction and interventions meet the changing individual needs of the student over time.		ELL Teachers Intervention Teachers School Leadership	