



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10122020_13:43

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Lone Jack School Center
Jonathan Defevers
101 Creech Hollow Road
Fourmile, Kentucky, 40939
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	9
Trends	10
Potential Source of Problem	13
Strengths/Leverages	16

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?

Lone Jack School Center progressively reviews, analyzes, and applies data results for continuous improvement. MAP testing is given three times per year; Fall, Winter, and Spring. After each round of testing, school leadership and teachers examine data results to determine the number of students meeting grade level standards, identify students who improve, identify students who are performing below grade level and at what percentile, and define the targeted students, making a plan to progress these students. Data is tracked over time to show yearly growth. Results are tracked through www.teach.mapnwea.org, where multiple reports are available. Data is collected and tracked using an Elgin School Assessment Data Sheet. MAP data is also tracked by the district personnel, who produces district results for all schools within the district. MAP data is correlated with KPREP scores based upon the KPREP Linking Study provided by NWEA. Teachers track data in SFA using unit Teacher Cycle Record Forms. SFA facilitator and teachers communicate in regards to the data. Facilitator gives feedback and provides resources to help improve instruction. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic there was no KPREP data to review from the previous year. Normally data would be analyzed at the school level (by teachers and administrators) and at the district level (by curriculum coaches). This data would be shared throughout the school and district as appropriate. The overall data would also be reported through local newspapers, district/school websites, and social media.

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: 41.3% of elementary students (grades 3-5) scored Proficient or Distinguished on KPREP Reading. This was a 1.3% increase from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. Compared to the district average of 51.5%, we are 10.2% below average. Compared to the state average of 54.6%, we are 13.3% below average. 21.7% of elementary students (grades 3-5) scored Proficient or Distinguished on KPREP Math This was a 29.2% decrease from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. Compared to the district average of 42.3%, we are below average by 20.6%. Compared to the state average of 48.6%, we are below average by 26.9%. 76.5% of middle school students (grades 6-8) scored Proficient or Distinguished on KPREP Reading. This was a 12.2% increase from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019. Compared to the district average of 71.7%, we are above average by 4.8%. Compared to the state average of 59.6%, we are above average by 16.9%. 51% of the middle school students (grades 6-8) scored Proficient or Distinguished on KPREP Math compared to the district average of 47.7% and the state average of 46.4% as well. This was a 7.7% increase from 2017- 2018 to 2018-2019. We are 3.3% above the district and 4.6% above the state average. In middle school Social Studies (8th grade) on KPREP, we saw a 4.3% increase in Proficiency from 60% in 2017-18 to 64.3% in 2018-19. We are 4.8% below the district average and 5.5% above the state average. In middle

school Writing (8th grade) on KPREP, our students decreased 9.3% in Proficiency from 45% in 2017-18 to 35.7% in 2018-19. The district average of 50% reflects that we are 14.3% below average. The state average of 31.9% reflects that we are 3.8% above average. In elementary Science, our students scored 15.8% Proficiency on the KPREP assessment compared to the district average of 23.7% and the state average of 31.7%. In middle school Science, our students scored 35.3% Proficiency on the KPREP assessment compared to the district average of 23% and the state average of 26%. Over a two year period, from Fall 2016 to Fall 2018, we saw a 13% decrease in the number of students in 3rd grade, 70% decrease in the number of students in 4th grade, 48% decrease in the number of students in 5th grade, and a 16% decrease in the number of students in 8th grade, bench marking at grade level on the MAP Reading assessment. We saw a 21% increase in the number of students in 7th grade bench, marking at grade level on the MAP Reading assessment. Over a two year period from Fall 2016 to Fall 2018, we saw a 11% decrease in the number of students in 3rd grade, 27% decrease in the number of students in 7th grade, and a 29% decrease in the number of students in 8th grade, bench marking at grade level on the MAP Math assessment. We saw a 17% increase in the number of students in 4th grade and a 31% increase in the number of students in 5th grade, bench marking at grade level on the MAP Math assessment. Non-Academic Current State: Lone Jack School Center's student attendance rate was 89.87% for the 2019-2020 school year, which was a small drop that may be attributed to the COVID-19 closures. This was lower than all the other school's in the district. The staff attendance rate was 96% for the 2019-2010 school year. This was right at what the attendance was for the other schools in the district. Attendance was a challenge for the previous school year given the COVID-19 closures. Based on data from the 2019-20 Impact survey showed that teachers rated the school leadership's effectiveness at 94%, which was 14% higher than the county average and 34% higher than the state average for K-12 schools. Additionally, teachers rated their readiness to address issues of diversity in the classroom at 81%, which is 6% higher than the district average and 7% higher than the state average for K-12 schools. The lowest rating on the survey was 50% on adequacy of the school's resources. Although this number was low, it was still 3% higher than the state average for K-12 schools. Based upon SFA (Success for All) Member Center data, the percentage of Read and Respond Forms (Reading homework) being returned consistently decreased in years past. In 2015-16, the response rate was 82.6%. There was a 15.6% decrease from 2015-16 to the beginning of the 2017-18 school year. At the beginning of the 2017-18 school year, the response rate was 67%. By the ending of the 2017-18 school year, we saw an 11.4% increase in the response rate. The read and respond response rate was 78% when school dismissed for COVID-19 in March 2020, which was a 10% increase from the 1st quarter to the 3rd quarter of the school year.

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.

Due to Covid-19 school closures, no KPREP data is available for the 2019-20 school year. Additionally all students were sent home to do Non-Traditional Instruction days for the last two months of school for the 2019-20 school year. With inconsistent parent support and numerous variables impacting teacher's ability to effectively communicate with students during this time, hours of instruction were lost, creating the possibility for gaps and regression in learning. 39% of the students in grade 3 scored at or below the Apprentice level in elementary Reading on the KPREP assessment in 2018-19. 70% of the students in grade 4 scored below Proficiency in elementary Reading as opposed to only 30% scoring Proficiency. The number of Novice for elementary (grades 3-5) Reading increased from 21.82% in 2017-18 to 38.29% in 2018-19. The number of Novice was slightly lower in elementary Math on the KPREP assessment for 2018-19 at 36.95%, but is still an area of concern. Almost half (44%) of the students in grade 7 scored at or below the Apprentice Level in middle school Math for 2018-19 school year. 65% of the students in grade 8 scored at or below the Apprentice Level in middle school Math for 2018-19 school year. When middle school (grades 6-8) Math scores were combined, 48.2% of the students scored below Proficiency for 2018-19. In Social Studies, 55% of the students in grade 5 (elementary) scored below Proficiency on the KPREP assessment for 2018-19. The number of grade 5 students scoring Distinguished decreased from 4.5% in 2017-18 to 0% in 2018-19. The number of grade 8 students scoring Distinguished remained at 0% in 2017-18 and 2018-19. In elementary (grade 4) Science, 85% of the students scored below Proficiency on the KPREP assessment in 2018-19, an increase of 15% from the previous year. In middle school (grade 7) Science, 66.6% of the students scored below Proficiency. There were no distinguished scores for 5th grade writing for 2018-19, and 67% of students scored below the Proficiency level. The number of grade 8 students scoring below proficiency was 64.7% for 2018-19 school year, which was a decrease in Novice, but an increase in Apprentice.

Trends

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

The Quality of School Climate and Safety Survey shows that 72.9% of students feel that adults in the school make sure all students get what they need to be successful. This survey replaced the TELL survey this past year. In the past the TELL survey communicated that the teacher population concludes that 25% of parents/guardians support teachers in their efforts to ensure student success. In 2013, 57.9% of teachers who took the TELL survey feel that parents/guardians support teachers, contributing to their success with students. In 2015, 43.7% of teachers who took the TELL survey feel that parents/guardians support teachers. Parental support has continued to decrease with only 1/4 of the parent/guardian population supporting teachers in their efforts to ensure student success. Based upon SFA (Success for All) Member Center data, the percentage of Read and Respond Forms (Reading homework) being returned consistently decreased in years past. In 2015-16, the response rate was 82.6%. There was a 15.6% decrease from 2015-16 to the beginning of the 2017-18 school year. At the beginning of the 2017-18 school year, the response rate was 67%. By the ending of the 2017-18 school year, we saw an 11.4% increase in the response rate. It remains at 78% for the 2019-20 school year. The SFA Reading Program's goal is to have at least an 80% return rate on Reading homework per quarter, every eight weeks. SFA data shows that there is a trend that this goal isn't being met on a consistent basis. This data could be a correlation with the results we are observing from the TELL survey, which concludes that only 25% of parent/guardians support teachers in their efforts to ensure student success. This data could also play a significant role in the success of student's reading achievement. Analyzing the KPREP data from the previous three academic years, informs us that we have decreased the number of students scoring at the Novice level; however, a vast majority of our students are now scoring in the area of Apprentice, which has been reflective of a three year period. 5% of third grade students, 40% of fourth grade students, and 56% of fifth grade students scored at the Apprentice level in Reading for the 2018-19 school year. 52.17% of third grade students, 30% of fourth grade students, and 27.27% of fifth grade students scored at the Apprentice level in Reading for the 2017-18 school year. When combined for a final percentage, 30% of elementary (grades 3-5) students scored at the Apprentice level. When compared to the number of students scoring at or above Proficiency (40%), we see a need to move students from Apprentice to Proficient in elementary Reading with a primary focus on second grade. When data was reviewed at the beginning of the school year with Angela Bray, a reading

specialist from the Southeast South Central Co-Op hired by Elgin, based this new focus on the previous years MAP data. In elementary (grades 3-5) Math, 35% of third grade students, 45% of fourth grade students, and 44% of fifth grade students scored at the Apprentice level for the 2018-19 school year. In elementary (grades 3-5) Math, 56.52% of third grade students, 10% of fourth grade students, and 27.27% of fifth grade students scored at the Apprentice level for the 2017-18 school year. When combined for a final percentage, 41% of elementary (grades 3-5) students scored at the Apprentice level on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment, 36.6% of elementary (grades 3-5) students scored at the Apprentice level on the 2017-18 KPREP assessment, which is a trend from the previous 2016-17 school year with 35.1% of students scoring at the Apprentice level as well. 22% of students scored at the Proficient level on the 2018-19 KPREP Math assessment, 38.18% of students scored at the Proficient level on the 2017-18 KPREP Math assessment, which reflects our need to move more students from Apprentice to Proficient; again with a primary focus on third grade. In Middle School (grades 6-8) Math, a trend continues to be recognized over a period of three academic years. 38% of sixth grade students, 39% of seventh grade students, and 53% of eighth grade students scored at the Apprentice level on the 2018-19 school year. 31.8% of sixth grade students, 50% of seventh grade students, and 60% of eighth grade students scored at the Apprentice level on the 2017-18 school year. When combined for a final percentage, 46.7% of Middle School (grades 6-8) students scored at the Apprentice level on the 2017-18 KPREP Math assessment. This percentage is higher than students combined scoring both Proficient and Distinguished (43.3%). Looking at the previous year's (2016-17) data, 54.8% of Middle School students scored at the Apprentice level. 44% of fifth grade (elementary) students scored at the Apprentice level on the Social Studies KPREP assessment for the 2018-19 school year. 45.5% of fifth grade (elementary) students scored at the Apprentice level on the Social Studies KPREP assessment for the 2017-18 school year. 40.9% of fifth grade students scored at the Apprentice level on the Social Studies KPREP assessment for the 2016-17 school year, reflecting that we need to move more students from Apprentice to Proficient. From 2016-17 school year to the 2017-18 school year, we saw a significant increase in the number of fifth grade students (elementary) scoring at the Apprentice level in Writing. 20.8% of students scored at the Apprentice level in 2016-17; whereas, 40.9% of students scored at the Apprentice level in 2017-18, which reflects that the number of Proficiency decreased. Although the number of Apprentice decreased in Middle School (8th grade) Writing from 2016-17 to 2017-18, 56.5% to 40%, the number of Novice increased from 4.3% (2016-17) to 15% (2017-18). Trending data shows that from Fall 2016 to Fall 2019, the percentage of fourth grade students performing below benchmark in Reading on the MAP assessment has progressively increased (Fall 2016: 9%, Fall 2017: 50%, and Fall 2018: 79%). However, only 47% of fourth grade students benchmarked below grade

level on the Fall 2019 MAP reading assessment. The percentage of fifth grade students performing below benchmark in Reading has also increased (Fall 2016: 32%, Fall 2017: 52%, Fall 2018: 80%, and Fall 2019: 86%). The percentage of sixth grade students performing below benchmark in Reading has consistently remained the same with little to no improvement (Fall 2016: 37%, Fall 2017: 30%, and Fall 2018: 37%). This year we did see an increase in the sixth grade students below benchmark (Fall 2019: 71%). This sudden increase can likely be attributed to regression due to the COVID-19 shutdown. The percentage of eighth grade students performing below benchmark in Reading has increased at a slower rate than other grade levels, but enough to become a concern for the future (Fall 2016: 24%, Fall 2017: 35%, Fall 2018: 40%, and Fall 2019: 33%). Trending data shows that from Fall 2016 to Fall 2019, the percentage of third grade students performing below benchmark in Math on the MAP assessment remained constant from Fall 2016 to Fall 2017 at 59%; however, from Fall 2017 to Fall 2018, it decreased to 48%, which showed as improvement. Third grade Math for Fall 2019 showed 62% scoring below benchmark, which is a big concern, but again may be attributed to the COVID-19 shutdown. The percentage of fourth grade students also remained the same from Fall 2016 to Fall 2017 at 67%; however, from Fall 2017 to Fall 2018, it increased to 84%, which becomes a potential area of concern. However, fourth grade math Fall 2019 scores showed that 53% scoring below benchmark, which is an improvement from Fall 2018 to Fall 2019. The percentage of fifth grade students performing below benchmark follows the same trend as third and fourth grade students. From Fall 2016 to Fall 2017, 29% of fifth grade students were performing below benchmark in Math; however, the percentage increased to 60% from Fall 2017 to Fall 2018, which also becomes a potential area of concern. Fall 2019 86% of fifth graders scored below benchmark, which also becomes a potential area of concern, which could be attributed to the COVID-19 shutdown. The percentage of sixth grade students performing below benchmark from Fall 2016 to Fall 2017 remained constant as well at 39%; however, increased a small percentage to 42% from Fall 2017 to Fall 2018, which is an area that will be addressed. In Fall 2019, the percent increased to 71% of sixth grade students scoring below benchmark, which targets them as an area of concern.

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](#)

To ensure that curriculum being taught is valid, teachers will work to align what is being taught to the common core standards. Additionally this summer teachers from across the district were chosen to align our virtual curriculum (Odysseyware) to the common core standards, district-wide curriculum maps, and follow the established pacing guides. Instructors are assigned based on certification or areas of expertise. A new teacher has been hired for Kindergarten. She is meeting with the assistant principal frequently and was assigned a strong instructional aid in her classroom for guidance as well. To monitor that curriculum is being taught in a rigorous and timely manner, observations will be done by administration and the SFA coordinator. During these observations, the observer will be monitoring the student learning targets and provide feedback as needed to the teachers. Learning targets will be created by the teachers based on the district units/common core standards. Additionally, teachers will turn in data regarding their completion of reading units to the SFA coordinator so that she can ensure their pacing is appropriate and help them adjust accordingly based on their submitted data. Teachers will also, adjust their pacing based on their own formative assessments and remediate as needed. Summative assessments will be used to plan for pacing of content for the next year and reteaching for the current year. Curriculum is reviewed annually by the district when the core content units are reviewed and created, and by individual teachers before the beginning of each school year. Vertical team meetings also provide opportunity for curriculum to be reviewed by teachers from every grade level in a subject. Vertical team meetings allows teachers to ensure all content is being covered and to identify gaps that may occur. The district organizes curriculum work teams when new standards are released. These teams are made up of teachers with expertise in the content area. The team works to deconstruct the standards and uses a backwards curriculum design to create rigorous assessments and learning targets to guide the units. Assessment types

included in district curriculum units are primarily summative. Teachers then incorporate their own formative assessments to monitor progress of the students learning, leading up to the district summative assessment. The types of questions used on both kinds of assessments are determined based on the similar types of questions students will encounter on the state test. The data from this summative assessments, as well as, from the MAP tests are used to inform curriculum and instructional practices. Additionally these help to measure the effectiveness of current programs being used in the classroom. We will use social media to keep parents informed of events, activities, curriculum, homework, reminders, etc. We will make every attempt to use it to inform parents of events, such as mid-terms and report cards being sent home, open house, and links to resources they can utilize at home to help their child be successful. Teachers will also use either Remind 101 or Class Dojo to keep parents informed on an individual student/class basis. The teacher and students will collaborate to set MAP goals for all tested areas (Reading, Math, Science, and Language). The goals will be set based on individual performance for each round of MAP testing. Teachers and students will look at cut-level RIT goals and track their progress throughout the year. Student participation in the goal setting process will make the students take responsibility for their growth. Due to Covid-19, we are limited to keeping students with their grade level this year. We will still have RTI/Challenge classes, where teachers will differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students, as identified by the MAP test. We will continue using simple solutions resources that consistently and continuously reinforce and teach common core standards at each grade level. Using these resources, teachers can track progress over time. Simple Solutions has been purchased for all tested areas, including first through eighth grade Reading and Math, Kindergarten through eighth grade Language, fourth and seventh grade Science, and second through eighth grade Social Studies. These resources are being used as a supplement to the core instructional materials. Instructional aides have been strategically placed with classes of concern and to provide additional support for individual students who are struggling to meet proficiency on both the KPREP and MAP assessments. Individual students who are scoring in the lowest quartile (25% or below) on any area of MAP testing, will be targeted by their teachers. Targeted interventions may include MobyMax or a similar supplemental program, where students can work on their level in order to grow. Also, teachers have access to MAP Accelerator starting this year in grades third through eighth. First and second grade teachers are using Imagine It Kits for intervention and to supplement core instruction. Finally, for all grades Save the Children is providing supplemental resources for reading. We will continue with attendance incentives similar to the ones we have done in the past, such as rewarding individual classes, students, and teachers for their attendance. The district attendance coordinator, school attendance clerk, Family Resource Youth Service Coordinator, assistant principal, and principal are also conducting phone

calls and home visits for absenteeism concerns. Partnering with the Save the Children (STC) program and the Family Resource Center, we will be involving students in opportunities for character development. One example is the Red Ribbon Week activities that are hosted by the FRYSC. Students get to participate in dress up days each day, are given a ribbon to wear, and watch a video each day about the importance of staying drug free.

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%.

Proficiency increased in Middle School Math (grades 6-8) from 30% to 51.8% and in Middle School Social Studies (8th grade) from 60% to 64.7% on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment. The percentage of students performing at the Distinguished level continued to increase for Middle School Reading (grades 6-8), from 16.7% TO 26.78%. 80.9% of sixth grade students, 72% of seventh grade students, and 76.4% of eighth grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished on the 2018-19 KPREP Reading assessment. 61.9% of sixth grade students scored Proficient/Distinguished on the 2018-19 KPREP Math assessment. On the Fall 2019 MAP assessment we had 67% of Kindergarteners, 83% of first graders, 84% of seventh graders, and 67% of eighth graders reaching Proficiency (50th percentile or above) in Reading. On the Fall 2019 Map, 92% of first graders, 74% of seventh graders, and 78% of eighth graders reaching Proficiency (50th percentile of above) in Math. On the Fall 2019 Map, 84% of seventh graders and 78% of eighth graders reaching Proficiency (50th percentile or above) in Language. On the Fall 2019 Map, 89% of seventh graders and 78% of eighth graders reaching Proficiency (50th percentile or above) in Science. In several areas, we were also first in the district in Percent Proficient: first and seventh grade reading; first, seventh, and eighth grade math; seventh and eighth grade language; and seventh grade science. According to SFA Member Center (core reading program) data, by the end of the third quarter of Reading (March 2019), which is when we dismissed for COVID-19, 100% of the seventh grade students and 94% of the eighth grade students were performing on grade level. For the 2019-20 school year, Elgin hired a Reading Specialist from Southeast South Central Co-Op to work with teachers to strengthen the instructional process in order to see student achievement increase. Second grade was the primary focus based on MAP data. We did see an increase in student achievement from Fall 2019 MAP assessment with 21% of students benchmarking to 31% benchmarking on the Winter 2019-20 assessment. Improvement was also shown with the tracking of SFA (Success for All-Reading) data, where 27% of second graders were performing at grade level at the beginning of the 2019-20 school year. During the first and second quarters of Reading, this improved to 43% and by the end of the third quarter, which is when we dismissed for COVID-19, 54% of second graders were performing at grade level.

Attachment Summary

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