

2019-20 Phase Two: WHS Needs Assessment for Schools_09022019_14:13

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

West Hopkins School

Eric Stone
2695 Rabbit Ridge Road
Nebo, Kentucky, 42441
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 10/25/2019

Last Modified: 12/16/2019

Status: Locked

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 | 8 |
| Trends | 9 |
| Potential Source of Problem..... | 10 |
| Strengths/Leverages | 11 |
| Attachment Summary | 12 |

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?

WHS process for collecting data is as follows. Data is collected from multiple sources such as classroom assessments, universal screeners (MAP & Brigance), state assessments, and district interim assessments. Teachers and leadership team look for specific content, student and teacher trends, and disaggregate the data in PLC's. The trends identified are based on both current and past data. Teachers tracks students using summative classroom assessment to monitor progress. The assessment and PD advisory committee (comprised of teachers, instructional assistants, and parents) review school procedures and needs while the attendance and culture panel focus on non-academic data. Special education teachers collect progress-monitoring data regularly. The leadership team meets regularly. Agendas are kept for meetings.

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.

Based on 2018-2019 KPREP data: 21% of 3rd grade students scored Novice in Reading, 21% of 3rd grade students scored Apprentice in Reading, 36% of 3rd grade students scored Apprentice in Reading, and 21% of 3rd grade students scored Distinguished in Reading; 9% of 3rd grade students scored Novice in Math, 30% of 3rd grade students scored Apprentice in Math, 55% of 3rd grade students scored Proficient in Math, and 6% of 3rd grade students scored Distinguished in Math; 24% of 4th grade students scored Novice in Reading, 37% of 4th grade students scored Apprentice in Reading, 37% of 4th grade students scored Proficient in Reading, 3% of 4th grade students scored Distinguished in Reading; 29% of 4th grade students scored Novice in Math, 42% of 4th grade students scored Apprentice in Math, 24% of 4th grade students scored Proficient in Math, 5% of 4th grade students scored Distinguished in Math; 16% of 4th grade students scored Novice in Science, 22% of 4th grade students scored Apprentice in Science, 18% of 4th grade students scored Proficient in Science, 0% of 4th grade students scored Distinguished in Science; 14% of 5th grade students scored Novice in Reading, 22% of 5th grade students scored Apprentice in Reading, 49% of 5th grade students scored Proficient in Reading, 14% of 5th grade students scored Distinguished in Reading; 16% of 5th grade students scored Novice in Math, 24% of 5th grade students scored Apprentice in Math, 39% of 5th grade students scored Proficient in Math, 20% of 5th grade students scored Distinguished in Math; 6% of 5th grade students scored Novice in Social Studies, 43% of 5th grade students scored Apprentice in Social Studies, 47% of 5th grade students scored Proficient in Social Studies, 4% of 5th grade students scored Distinguished in Social Studies; 27% of 5th grade students scored Novice in On-Demand Writing, 41% of 5th grade students scored Apprentice in On-Demand Writing, 33% of 5th grade students scored Proficient in On-Demand Writing, 0% of 5th grade students scored Distinguished in On-Demand Writing; Combined Proficient and Distinguished scores for reading in Elementary (3-5) was 44%; Combined Proficient and Distinguished scores for math in Elementary (3-5) was 51%; 19% of 6th grade students scored Novice in Reading, 12% of 6th grade students scored Apprentice in Reading, 40% of 6th grade students scored Proficient in Reading, 29% of 6th grade students scored Distinguished in Reading; 14% of 6th grade students scored Novice in Math, 36% of 6th grade students scored Apprentice in Math, 40% of 6th grade students scored Proficient in Math, 10% of 6th grade students scored Distinguished in Math; 13% of 7th grade students scored Novice in Reading, 17% of 7th grade students scored Apprentice in Reading, 51% of 7th grade students scored Proficient in Reading, 19% of 7th grade students scored Distinguished in Reading; 9% of 7th grade students scored Novice in Math, 49% of 7th grade students scored Apprentice in

Math, 30% of 7th grade students scored Proficient in Math, 13% of 7th grade students scored Distinguished in Math; 13% of 7th grade students scored Novice in Science, 57% of 7th grade students scored Apprentice in Science, 26% of 7th grade students scored Proficient in Science, 4% of 7th grade students scored Distinguished in Science; 7% of 8th grade students scored Novice in Reading, 20% of 8th grade students scored Apprentice in Reading, 38% of 8th grade students scored Proficient in Reading, 36% of 8th grade students scored Distinguished in Reading; 14% of 8th grade students scored Novice in Math, 47% of 8th grade students scored Apprentice in Math, 24% of 8th grade students scored Proficient in Math, 16% of 8th grade students scored Distinguished in Math; 0% of 8th grade students scored Novice in Social Studies, 40% of 8th grade students scored Apprentice in Social Studies, 47% of 8th grade students scored Proficient in Social Studies, 13% of 8th grade students scored Distinguished in Social Studies; 11% of 8th grade students scored Novice in On-Demand Writing, 53% of 8th grade students scored Apprentice in On-Demand Writing, 20% of 8th grade students scored Proficient in On-Demand Writing, 16% of 8th grade students scored Distinguished in On-Demand Writing; Combined Proficient and Distinguished Scores for Middle School (6-8) in Reading was 71%; Combined Proficient and Distinguished Scores for Middle School (6-8) in Math was 44%.

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.

The indicator score for growth was 46.3, which placed our elementary school in the "very low" category. The separate academic indicator score was 59.3, which placed our elementary school in the "low" category. Eighteen percent (18.4%) of elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in Science. Thirty-two percent (32.7%) of elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in writing. Forty-one percent (41.7%) of female elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in writing, as opposed to only twenty-four (24%) of male elementary students. Twenty-six (26.5%) of elementary students scored novice in writing. Sixty percent (60.3%) of female elementary students scored proficient or distinguished in math, as opposed to just forty-one percent (41%) of male elementary students. Ninety percent (90.9%) of female students in 8th grade last year scored proficient or distinguished in reading, as opposed to just fifty-six percent (46.5%) of male students. Sixty-three percent (63.7%) of female students in 8th grade last year scored proficient or distinguished in math, as opposed to just seventeen percent (17.3%) of male students. Fifty-four percent (54.5%) of female middle school students scored proficient or distinguished in writing, as opposed to just seventeen percent (17.4%) of male students. Only two percent (2.5%) of non-economically disadvantaged students in middle school scored novice in reading, as opposed to sixteen percent (16.1%) of economically disadvantaged students.

Trends

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

Distinguished reading scores for elementary male students have decreased: 22.8% (16-17), 14.7% (17-18), 8.2% (18-19); Distinguished math scores for all students in elementary have decreased: 30.7% (16-17), 28.6% (17-18), 11.2% (18-19); Novice math scores for all students in elementary have increased: 10.9% (16-17), 11.3% (17-18), 17.2% (18-19); Novice writing scores for all elementary students have increased: 13.3% (16-17), 15.6% (17-18), 26.5% (18-19); P/D Writing scores for elementary students have decreased: 60% (16-17), 40% (17-18), 32.7% (18-19); Novice writing scores for economically disadvantaged elementary students have increased: 14.3% (16-17), 18.5% (17-18), 34.4% (18-19); Distinguished math scores for economically disadvantaged middle school students have decreased: 10.2% (16-17), 7.7% (17-18); 7.5% (18-19); Novice math scores for middle school students with a disability have increased: 15.8% (16-17), 21.7% (17-18); 22.7% (18-19); Distinguished social studies scores for male middle school students have decreased: 30% (16-17), 14.3% (17-18); 8.7% (18-19)

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 2: Design and Deliver Instruction - How is learning monitored before, during, and after instruction? What process is in place to ensure students have an understanding of learning expectations (e.g. learning targets, goal setting, and purpose) and know the criteria for success?

KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy - What processes are used by schools/district leadership to deconstruct standards to ensure learning targets are congruent to the standards and are the laser focus of instruction? What type of feedback is given to students on their progression of learning? How do school/district leadership ensure teachers utilize formative and summative information to increase student achievement? What systems are in place so that students can communicate how they track and evaluate their progress and set goals?

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data - What systems are in place to ensure that student data is collected, analyzed, and being used to drive classroom instruction? What systems are in place to ensure that students are actively involved in knowing their own data and making decisions about their own learning?

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%.

Elementary Reading P/D has remained stable at around 55%: 55.5% (16-17), 55.6% (17-18), 54.4% (18-19); Middle school Reading P/D scores have increased from 51.5% in 2013-14 to 71.4% in 18-19. Middle school Reading Novice scores have decreased from 24.3% in 2015-16 to 12% in 18-19. The past three years show a reduction in middle school Novice Math scores: 20.4% (16-17), 17.4% (17-18), 11.13% (18-19). Middle school Writing P/D scores have increased over the past three years: 17.2% (16-17), 30.3% (17-18), 35.6% (18-19).

Attachment Summary

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