



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10072020_15:32

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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

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	8
Trends	9
Potential Source of Problem	10
Strengths/Leverages	11
Attachment Summary	13

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 Right Fork School Center CSIP Team first met on October 12, 2020. During this meeting, the CSIP team analyzed assessment data from the 2018-19 school year (KPREP assessment data), assessment data from the 2019020 school year (Fall and Winter MAP data), as well as Covid-19 re-entry reports from our teachers to determine the school's current academic state as well as priorities/concerns, trends, potential sources of the problem, and school strengths/leverages. The Right Fork School Center CSIP Team then met again on October 19, 2020 to focus on the non-academic state of the school. in this meeting, the CSIP Team discussed and identified potential sources of problems revealed through the school's current state including potential achievement gaps and student technology and physical needs as a result of the current COVID-19 pandemic. Right Fork School Center CSIP team members and their roles within the school are as follows: James Blevins-Assistant Principal/5th, 6th, 8th grades Social Studies Teacher, CSIP Team Lead; Robin Redmond-Media Specialist, SFA Reading Facilitator, SBDMC member, and parent; Rhonda Collins-SPED Teacher, SBDMC Member, and Reading Recovery Teacher; Cierrah Emery-SFA/ELA Teacher, Odyssey-Ware Administrator (Virtual Learning Program), and SBDMC Member; Rosetta Sinkhorn-FRYSC Coordinator; Stephanie Brock-Attendance Clerk; and Doris Caldwell-parent. CSIP Team meetings going forward will be held on the second Tuesday of each month, prior to regularly scheduled SBDMC meetings.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

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.

Current Academic State: Due to the lack of KPREP scores from the 2019-20 school year, we re-analyzed our school's KPREP scores from the 2018-19 school year for our current academic state. Based on KPREP scores from the 2018-19 school year, 55.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in elementary reading, +0.6 above the state average, 41.7% 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 school social studies, +9.5 above the state average. 18.8% of students scored proficient/distinguished in elementary science, -1.9 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 writing, -6.9 below the state average. 83.3% of students scored proficient/distinguished in middle grade 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 in elementary reading, compared to 60% for non-economically disadvantaged students. 43.8% of economically disadvantaged scored proficient/distinguished in elementary math,

compared to 90% for non-economically disadvantaged students. Non-Academic Current State: Certified Staff Attendance was 94.39%, a decrease of 1.84% from the previous school year. There were 50 behavior referrals, up from the 44 of the previous year. The Impact Kentucky Survey results indicated that 90% of the faculty responded that they feel ready to address issues of diversity as compared to only 74% of teachers across Kentucky, 89% feel they receive adequate feedback and coaching as compared to 55% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 81% feel confident in managing student behavior as compared to only 63% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 89% feel they receive quality professional growth and learning opportunities as compared to only 56% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 71% of teachers feel the school has adequate resources as compared to only 47% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 85% have a positive perception of the overall social and learning climate of the school as compared to only 58% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, and 86% have positive perceptions of the school leadership's effectiveness, as compared to 60% of teachers in other Kentucky schools. Other data to be included in the current academic state of our school include student attendance rate for the 2019-20 school year which was 91.31%, and the number of homeless students (37). In addition to this the School Climate and Safety Survey for Right Fork School Center strongly agreed that 79.6% of students in grades 3-5 feel that their school is a caring place, 71.4% of students indicate that their teachers make them feel welcome in their classroom, 79.6% indicated that adults in their school care about them, 81.6% of teachers expect them to do their best all the time, 71.4% indicated that they are taught ways to stop mean or hurtful behavior when they see it happen, and 73.5% indicated that if students are mean or hurtful to other students there is a safe way to report it to adults. In grades 6-8 92.4% agreed or strongly agreed that their school is a caring place, 84.9% agreed or strongly agreed that they feel like they belong at their school, 86% agreed or strongly agreed that their teachers made them feel welcome in their classrooms, 93.8% agreed/strongly agreed that when they need help, they can ask a teacher, and 93.7% agreed/strongly agreed that their school is a caring place.

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.

According to 2018-2019 KPREP data, the 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 school year. The Proficiency Score for 3rd grade Reading was 58.3, a -40.3 decrease from the previous year. The Proficiency Score for 3rd grade Math was 41.7, an -49.6 decrease from the previous year. 18.8% of students scored proficient/distinguished in Elementary School Science, -4.9 below the district average and -12.9 below the state average. 41.7% of students scored Proficient/Distinguished in Elementary School writing, -11.3 below the district average and -4.9 below the state average. 25% of students scored proficient/distinguished in Middle School Writing, -25 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 Elementary School and Middle School 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 Middle School Science, we will focus on Key Core Work Process 1: Design and Deploy Standards because we feel that increased familiarity with the new state science standards will have the greatest impact on KPREP Science scores. KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction will be a general focus to produce desired changes and outcomes. Additional resources such as IKWEST 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 and implementation of these resources. The school's writing policy has been revised and includes universal strategies and practices (for example: the four square method for pre-writing and planning), periodic required writing activities in all subjects, and periodic submission of student work samples for review. The CSIP team cited behavior as a potential source of the problem in math. In regards to math scores, 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 the MAP Math Accelerator program.

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 according to the 2018-19 KPREP report: 55.2% of students scored proficient/distinguished in Elementary School reading, +3.7 above the district average and +.6 above the state average. 51.7% of students scored proficient/distinguished in Elementary School math, +9.4% above the district average and +3.1 above the state average. Elementary School 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 Elementary School Social Studies, +5.1% above the district average and +9.5% above the state average. 68.5% of students scored proficient/distinguished in Middle School Reading, +8.9% above the state average. The Middle School Math NAPD score of 64.8 was a +9.3% gain from the previous year. 83.3% of students scored proficient/distinguished in Middle School Studies, +14.2% above the district average and +24.5% above the state average. The Middle School Social Studies NAPD core of 91.7 was a +13.7 point gain from the previous year. 31.8% of students scored proficient/distinguished in Middle School Science, +8.8% above the district average and +5.8% above the state average. The Middle School Science NAPD score of 47.7 was a 3.9 point gain from the previous year. Non-Academic strengths/leverages include that the Impact Kentucky Survey results indicated that 90% of the faculty responded that they feel ready to address issues of diversity as compared to only 74% of teachers across Kentucky, 89% feel they receive adequate feedback and coaching as compared to 55% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 81% feel confident in managing student behavior as compared to only 63% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 89% feel they receive quality professional growth and learning opportunities as compared to only 56% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 71% of teachers feel the school has adequate resources as compared to only 47% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, 85% have a positive perception of the overall social and learning climate of the school as compared to only 58% of teachers in other Kentucky schools, and 86% have positive perceptions of the school leadership's effectiveness, as compared to 60% of teachers in other Kentucky schools. In addition to this the School Climate and Safety Survey for Right Fork School Center strongly agreed that 79.6% of students in grades 3-5 feel that their school is a caring place, 71.4% of students indicate that their teachers make them feel welcome in their classroom, 79.6% indicated that

adults in their school care about them, 81.6% of teachers expect them to do their best all the time, 71.4% indicated that they are taught ways to stop mean or hurtful behavior when they see it happen, and 73.5% indicated that if students are mean or hurtful to other students there is a safe way to report it to adults. In grades 6-8 92.4% agreed or strongly agreed that their school is a caring place, 84.9% agreed or strongly agreed that they feel like they belong at their school, 86% agreed or strongly agreed that their teachers made them feel welcome in their classrooms, 93.8% agreed/strongly agreed that when they need help, they can ask a teacher, and 93.7% agreed/strongly agreed that their school is a caring place.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 October 2020 CSIP Committee Meeting Agendas	October 2020 CSIP Committee Meeting Agendas	.