



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for  
Districts\_09302020\_09:20

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

**Bell County**  
**Tom Gambrel**  
211 Virginia Ave  
Pineville, Kentucky, 40977  
United States of America

---

## Table of Contents

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts	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 Districts**

## 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 district as well as the processes, practices and conditions that contributed to that state.

The needs assessment provides the framework for **all** districts 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 districts, each district 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.

## Protocol

. Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results. Include names of district leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

The District Continuous Improvement Planning Team (leadership team) consists of one representative from each school within the district, the Director of Pupil Personnel, the Director of Special Education, both District Instructional Supervisors, the Gifted and Talented Coordinator, the District Instructional Specialist, and the Director of Technology. The planning team meets in stages that correlate with the outlined Phases from the Kentucky Department of Education (Phase I, Phase II, Phase III, and Phase IV). The team meets 3 - 4 times during the process with tasks to be completed in between the designated meetings in addition to progress monitoring meetings occurring after the plan has gone through board approval. Documentation of all meetings includes agendas, resource materials and meetings notes. There are also informal meetings held throughout the process where small groups of the team work together regarding specific data, goals, strategies, and activities for continuous improvement. Data is analyzed at both the school and district levels. The analysis at both levels includes reviewing elementary, middle and high school as well as each individual content areas at all levels. The analysis is then narrowed down by the grade levels and gap groups. For example, elementary reading is drilled down to the 3rd grade, 4th grade, and 5th grade scores and then analyzed specifically for significant increases, decreases, trends over time, etc. The results of the analysis is used at the teacher level, grade level, school level, and district level to create goals and action plans for the current school year. This year with the lack of new KPREP data due to COVID-19, the amount of data available has limited the analysis process.

## 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 district 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 2018-19.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2018-19 to 288 in 2019-20.
- Survey results and perception data indicated 74% of the district's teachers received adequate professional development.

Current Academic State: -District Elementary Level (made up of 6 elementary schools) received a 3 star rating with 1 school at 2 star level, 4 at 3 star level, and 1 at 4 star level). -The District Elementary Proficiency Indicator (reading and math at grades 3 - 5) is categorized as low (66.2) with 1 school being very low, 3 at low, 2 medium and 1 categorized as high. -The District Elementary Separate Academic Indicator (science, social studies and writing at grades 3-5) is categorized as medium (67.3) with 1 school as low, 4 at medium, and 1 school at high. -The District Elementary Growth Indicator is categorized as high (63.8) with 1 school at low, 1 at medium, 2 at high, and 2 at very high. -District Middle Level (made up of 6 middle schools) received a 4 star rating with 2 schools at 3 star level, 3 schools at 4 star level, and 1 school at the 5 star level (Bell Central School Center - 2nd in the state). -The District Middle Level Proficiency Indicator (reading and math at grades 6-8) is categorized as high (79.6) with 2 schools being medium, 3 schools being high, and 1 school being very high. -The District Middle Level Separate Academic Indicator (science, social studies and writing at grades 6-8) is categorized as high (72.4) with 4 at the medium level, 1 at the high, and 1 at the very high level. -The District Middle Level Growth Indicator is categorized as high (59.7) with 3 schools at the medium

level, 1 at high, and 2 at the very high category. -The District High School Level (made up of 1 high school) received a 2 star rating. -The District High School Level Proficiency Indicator (reading and math from ACT) is categorized as low (49.7) with the high school having a score of 50 - low. -The District High School Level Separate Academic Indicator (science and writing) is categorized as medium (64.4) with the high school score of 65 - medium. -The District High School Transition Readiness Indicator is categorized as low (65.4) with the high school scoring 67.8 low. -The District High School Graduation Indicator is categorized as high (96.5) with the high school scoring 97.1 - very high. -One of the few new pieces of academic data is the ACT results at the high school. The ACT Average Composite for the 18-19 school year was 18.1 and showed a .6 improvement moving to 18.7 average composite for the 19-20 school year. Non-Academic Current State: -District Attendance continues to be a focus with our district average being below the state for the past 5 years. From 2016-2017 when our attendance was 92.26% (state 94.4%), our district did show a slight increase in 2017-2018 to 92.56% (state 94.5%) and we maintained that growth with our 2018-2019 attendance of 92.57% (state 94.2%). However, our goal is for our district attendance to reach the level of the state average. -Teacher attendance - -District enrollment continues to decrease at an alarming rate. At present our district enrollment has decreased by 91 students this year as compared to the same time last school year. -IMPACT Survey Results - When analyzing the results for the district as a whole, the lowest area by far was the topic of Resources with a 52% rating compared to Kentucky's state wide rating of 46%. In reviewing the questions for this area of the survey, findings show a wide range of percentages of favorable question responses from 17% on the low end to 80% on the high end. Thus, this area has some positives as well as several areas of need (technology, specialists, and money) according to the teachers. One K-8 school had 7 or 8 areas rated well below the average score at the state level. Our high school survey results also showed 5 of the 8 areas being rated well below the average score.

## Priorities/Concerns

. Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

**NOTE:** These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) 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.

-District Elementary Math Proficient/Distinguished percentage was well below the state average (48.6%) with a score of 42.3%. 4 out of 6 elementary schools were below the state average. -District Elementary Reading Proficient/Distinguished percentage was below the state average (54.6%) with a score of 51.5%. 4 out of 6 elementary schools were below the state average. -Both the District Elementary and Middle Level Science Proficient/Distinguished percentages were below the state average (ES - 31.7% and MS - 26%) with scores of ES 23.7% and MS 23%. 5 out of 6 elementary schools were below the state average. 2 out of 6 middle schools were below the state average. - High School Reading Proficient/Distinguished percentage was below the state average; High School Math Proficient/Distinguished percentage was below the state average; the High School Writing Proficient/Distinguished percentage was below the state average. -High School Transition was categorized as Low. -A priority/concern that has been added to our district this 2020-2021 school year is the impact virtual instruction for either our entire student population or a significant number will have on student achievement and learning. Being able to provide high quality instruction in multiple platforms to keep achievement gaps from increasing to a minimum is a real and present issue for our district.



## Trends

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

- Elementary reading and math continues to be our significant areas of improvement as a district. Both of these areas are below the state average for a third consecutive year. Reading - 16/17 score 68.5 to 17/18 score 70.9 to 18/19 score 69.2. Math - 16/17 score 64.9 to 17/18 score 64.3 to 18/19 score 63.2. -High school proficiency was rated as Low based on the ACT score for the 18/19 school year. The high school had declined during the two previous years and this trend also continued for the 18/19 school year.

## 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](#)

The district will focus resources and efforts in the Key Core Work Process areas of Deploy Standards (ELA, Math and Social Studies Standards) and Design and Deliver Instruction. These same areas will be utilized to target increased proficiency scores at the high school. The district has used The Opportunity Myth as a starting point with the work on standards and the quality of instruction including student engagement, high expectations, grade appropriate assignments, and strong instruction.

## Strengths/Leverages

. Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the district.

**Example:** Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

Overall our middle school is our strength. Our district has six K-8 schools, so we actually have 6 middle schools. Our district is a 4 star as a whole at the district level. The percentage of proficient and distinguished students is higher than the state average in reading, math, social studies and writing. Our high school graduation rate is also a strength as it has consistently been at a high level: 2017-2018 - 98% and 2018-2019 - 97.1%.

# Attachment Summary

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