2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10112020_13:56

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Carlisle County High School
Kelli Edging
4557 State Route 1377
Bardwell, Kentucky, 42023
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/12/2020
Status: Locked

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 7
Trends 8
Potential Source of Problem 9
Strengths/Leverages 10
Attachment Summary 11

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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?

The principal, guidance counselor, and teachers spend several PLC meetings reviewing and analyzing state assessment data as well as determining school improvement goals. In addition, the SBDM council (Kelli Edging, Principal; Sarah Workman, teacher; Katie Samples, teacher; Sawyer Rambo, teacher; Jami Williams, parent; Cinda Wilson, parent) also reviews and analyzes the data during the October SBDM meeting. The principal and teachers meet monthly in PLC meetings and use a data protocol that includes PDSA process to review TruScore and EOP interim assessment data. Implementation and impact checks will be completed by the SBDM council following the approval of the CSIP. Meetings are documented with agendas and minutes.

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: 39.5% of students scored P/D in writing, while only 20% of gap students scored P/D in writing. 32.5% of students scored P/D in reading, but only 9.1% of gap students scored P/D in reading. In math, only 26.3% of students scored P/D and only 10% of gap students scored P/D. 18.4% of students scored P/D in science, while only 5% of gap students scored P/D. Juniors composite score on the ACT was 19.9. In 2019-2019, transition readiness was 84.7%, which is well above the state average of 91.1%. Non-academic: Teacher attendance rate in 2018-2019 was 95.9% and increased to 97% in 2019-2020. The number of behavior referrals increased from 140 in 2018-2019 to 206 in 2019-2020.

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.

90.9% of gap students scored below proficiency in reading as opposed to 387.9% of non-gap learners. 90% of gap students scored below proficiency in math as opposed to 55.5% of non-gap learners. 95% of gap students scored below proficiency in writing as opposed to 66.6% of non-gap learners. 80% of gap students scored below proficiency in science as opposed to 38.9% of non-gap learners.

Trends

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

From the data, we see that our gap students under perform when compared to non-gap students in the areas of reading, math, science, and writing. Our composite ACT score increased 2.3 points from 17.6 in 2018-2019 to 19.9 in 2019-2020.

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 resources and improvement efforts need to focus on #5 designing, aligning, and delivering support processes to our gap students.

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%.

Our transition readiness rate from 2018-19 was 84.7%, which is well above the state average of 66.8%; and in 2019-2020 our graduation rate was 97.1%, which is also above the state average.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)