



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Districts_10132020_10:15

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

East Bernstadt Independent

Vicki Jones

East Bernstadt, null, 40729

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

Teachers collect and analyze student data continuously through classroom analysis and PLC meetings. School level data is analyzed by classroom teachers as well as the leadership team, which includes the principal, superintendent, academic specialist, and special education director. Other stakeholders such as parents and community members are involved in the analysis of data and needs assessment. Sources of data that are analyzed include MAP, Past KPREP data, attendance, behavior, and classroom assessment data. Stakeholders are organized into committee groups by content area to examine strengths, areas for improvement, barriers, and formulate strategies to eliminate barriers and reach goals. Data is disaggregated by subgroups to identify gaps and look for ways to close the achievement gap. Teams continue to meet throughout the year to adjust instruction and allocate resources as needed. All funds are budgeted based on the needs assessment and the goals in the CSIP/CDIP. Minutes and/or sign-in sheets document each meeting.

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.

According to our KPREP data:65.8% of our elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Reading compared to the state at 54.6%64.8% of our elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Math compared to the state at 48.6%37.9% of our elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Science compared to the state at 31.7%76.4% of our elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Social Studies compared to the sate at 53%59.7% of our elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Writing compared to the state at 46.6%. 81.3% of our middle school students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Reading compared to the state at 59.6%. 45.1% of our middle school students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Math compared to the state at 46.4%. 50.0% of our middle school students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Science compared to the state at 26.0%. 70.6% of our middle school students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Social Studies compared to the state at 58.8%. 64.7% of our middle school students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Math compared to the state at 31.9%

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.

Only 45.1% of our middle school students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Math compared to the state at 46.4%. Only 37.9 of our elementary school students scored proficient or distinguished in the area of Science which is a low percentage. Students with a disability scored lower then all students in each subject area at both elementary and middle school.

Trends

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

Middle school math is still an area of concern since we have consistently scored lower than the state and have a low percentage scoring P/D. The group of students with and IEP score lower than students without in all subject areas.

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](#)

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards: Our curriculum documents will need revised to reflect changes adopted by the state. We will review and revise our current curriculum maps/pacing guides in the areas of math, reading, and writing. We will also investigate more research-based practices and resources to enhance the instruction in these areas. KCWP 5: Design, Align, and Deliver Support: We will revisit our PBIS expectations and procedures to ensure implementation with fidelity school-wide. We will continuously review and analyze student data to ensure research based interventions are in place to remove barriers to learning. KCWP 6: Schools must ensure they create, nurture, and sustain a fair and caring learning environment. The school will ensure that students are safe and their individual needs are being met.



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%.

Reading, writing and social studies is a strength with elementary and middle exceeding the state average. The percentage of student scoring P/D in Reading were 65.8 and the state 54.6 at the elementary level. The middle school P/D% was 81.3 and the state was 59.6. In the area of social studies, the P/D percentage at elementary was 76.4 for the school and the state was 53.0. The middle school social studies scored 70.6% P/D and the state was 58.8. Both subjects have a high percentage of P/D at both elementary and middle and exceeded the state.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 Data Ananalysis	Analysis of the most current KPREP Data	•
 Elementary and Middle School Assessment Plan	NA	•