

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10172019_16:36

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Right Fork School Center
Bobbi Carter
5296 Hwy. 221
Stoney Fork, Kentucky, 40988
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/05/2019
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 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

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 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/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. 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/district councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

The Right Fork CSIP Team first met on 10/23/2019. During this meeting, the CSIP team analyzed recently release K-PREP assessment data from the previous school year to determine the school's Current Academic State, as well as Priorities/Concerns, Trends, Potential Sources of the Problem, and Strengths/Leverages. The Right Fork CSIP Team then met on 10/30/19 to focus on the the Non-Academic Current State of the School. Right Fork School CSIP Team members and their roles within the school are as follows: Mike Bolton - Asst. Principal, 5th & 8th grade Social Studies teacher, CSIP Team Lead; Robin Redmond - Media Specialist, Reading Facilitator, 7th Grade ELA Teacher, SBDM council member, and parent; Rhonda Collins - K-3 Social Studies, Art, Music, and Physical Education Teacher, SBDM council member; Cierrah Emery - 2nd & 3rd grade Math & K-3 Reading teacher, SBDM council member; James Blevins - Reading Grades 6-8 Teacher, STLP Sponsor, and parent; Stephanie Brock - Attendance Clerk; Rosetta Haley - FRYSC Coordinator. In that meeting, the CSIP Team also identified potential sources of problems revealed through analysis of the school's current state. CSIP Team meetings going forward will be held on the second Tuesday of each month, prior to regularly scheduled SBDM council meetings.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



[CSIP Team Meeting Agenda 10-23-19](#)



[CSIP Team Meeting Agenda 10-30-19](#)

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 (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (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 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

Current Academic State: 55.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in elementary reading, +0.6 above the state average. 51.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in elementary math, +3.1 above the state average. 41.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in elementary writing, -4.9 below the state average. 62.5% of students scored proficient/distinguished in elementary social studies, +9.5 above the state average. 18.8% of students scored proficient/distinguished in elementary science, -12.9 below the state average. 68.5% of students scored proficient/distinguished in middle grades reading, +8.9 above the state average. 40.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in middle grades math, -5.7 below the state average. 25.0% of students scored proficient/distinguished in middle grades writing, -6.9 below the state average. 83.3% of students scored proficient/distinguished in middle grades social studies, +24.5 above the state average. 31.8% of students scored proficient/distinguished in middle grades science, +5.8 above the state average. 54.2% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficient/distinguished on elementary reading, compared to 60.0% for non-economically disadvantaged. 43.8% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficient/distinguished on elementary math, compared to 90.0% for non-economically disadvantaged.

Non-Academic Current State: Certified Staff Attendance was 96.23%, an increase from 87.0% the previous year. There were 44 discipline referrals, down from 105 the previous year. AdvancED Survey resulted in an overall score of 4.78, above the network average of 4.08. Results also showed scores above the network average in every section.

Priorities/Concerns

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

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

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.

Proficiency score for Elementary School (ES) reading was 69.5, down -8.7 from the previous year. Proficiency scores for Middle School (MS) writing was 50.0, a -11.0 decrease from the previous year. Proficiency score for 3rd grade reading was 58.3, a -40.3 decrease from the previous year. Proficiency score for 3rd grade math was 41.7, a -49.6 decrease from the previous year. 18.8% of students scored proficient/distinguished in ES science, -4.9 below the district average and -12.9 below the state average. 41.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in ES writing, -11.3 below the district average and -4.9 below the state average. 25.0% of students scored proficient/distinguished in MS writing, -25.0 below the district average and -6.9 below the state average.

Trends

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

Both ES and MS writing have been areas of concern for the previous two academic years.

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](#)

-In regards to MS science, we will focus on Key Core Work Process 1: Design and Deploy Standards as we feel that increased familiarity with the new state science standards will have the greatest impact on science scores.-KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction will be a general focus to produce desired changes. Additional resources such as IKWEST last year and Project Lead the Way (PTLW) for science have been purchased, and all science teachers have received training to implement these resources. Increased observations and feedback will also help to ensure effective instruction. The school's writing policy is also currently under revision and will include universal strategies and practices (for example: the four square method for pre-writing), periodic required writing activities in all subjects, and periodic submission of student work samples for review.-The CSIP Team felt that behavior was a potential source of the problem, especially regarding 8th grade math scores. As a result, the school will focus on KCWP 6: Design, Align, and Deliver Support in order to better ensure that behavioral interventions are taking place, and that desired behaviors are positively reinforced by school leadership and teachers. We also systematically deliver support to students scoring below benchmark in both reading and math on MAP testing by scheduling time for each student to spend on the Mobymax computer program and other interventions.

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%.

Academic strengths/leverages: 55.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in ES reading, +3.7% above the district average and +.6 above the state average. 51.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in ES math, +9.4% above the district average and +3.1% above the state average. ES Math had an NAPD score of 71.6, a +3.2 point gain from the previous year. 62.5% of students scored proficient/distinguished in ES social studies, +5.1% above the district average and +9.5% above the state average. 68.5% of students scored proficient/distinguished in MS reading, +8.9% above the state average. MS Math NAPD score of 64.8, +9.3 point gain from the previous year. 83.3% of students scored proficient/distinguished in MS social studies, +14.2% above the district average and +24.5% above the state average. MS social studies NAPD score of 91.7, +13.7 point gain from the previous year. 31.8% of students scored proficient/distinguished in MS science, +8.8% above the district average and +5.8% above the state average. MS science NAPD score of 47.7, +3.9 gain from the previous year. Non-academic strengths/leverages: Certified Staff Attendance was 96.23%, an increase from 87.0% the previous year. There were 44 discipline referrals, down from 105 the previous year. AdvancED Survey resulted in an overall score of 4.78, above the network average of 4.08. Results also showed scores above the network average in every section.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 CSIP Team Meeting Agenda 10-23-19	CSIP Team Meeting Agenda for 10-23-19. During this meeting, K-PREP results were analyzed to determine current academic state, priorities/concerns, trends, potential source of problem, and strengths/leverages.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
 CSIP Team Meeting Agenda 10-30-19	CSIP Team Meeting Agenda for 10-30-19. During this meeting, staff attendance reports, behavior reports, and AdvancED surveys were analyzed to determine non-academic current state.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">