2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_08242020_15:55

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Livingston Central High School
Stephanie Woods
750 US Highway 60 W
Smithland, Kentucky, 42081
United States of America

Table of Contents

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?

Student ongoing data is collected following any summative assessment which include common assessments given at the end of each 9weeks, ACT, STAR, etc. Data is placed into a graph to measure growth over time. This data is disaggregated by teacher PLC as well as during SBDM meetings. The data is used to ensure teachers are teaching content needed for the students to be successful as well as to ensure students are showing growth over time in all content areas. Meetings are also held individually at the end of each 9-weeks period with students showing little to no growth or those students with Ds and/or Fs. The teacher PLCs meet twice a month within their content area and once a month with the administration. The SBDM meets monthly. SBDM members include Stephanie Wood-Principal, Leigh Vick-Teacher, Jennifer Ashley-Teacher, Zeke Berg-Teacher, Jim Parks-Parent and Corey Vincent-Parent. SBDM committees meet monthly. Curriculum/Instruction committee includes Josh Edwards-Chair, Amanda Elrod, Derek Morse, Jessie Gordon, Josh Johnson, Jimmy Dyer, Marie Cooper, Greta Ramage, and Geco Ross. Assessment Committee includes Scott Coleman, Regina Durard, Jessie Gordon, Rita Hosick, Kathy Toon and Stephanie Wood.

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.

33% of our Juniors met the benchmark in Math on the ACT during Spring testing. 10% of our Juniors met the benchmark in Science on the ACT during Spring testing. 45% of our Juniors met the benchmark in English on the ACT during Spring testing. 27% of our Juniors met the benchmark in Reading on the ACT during Spring testing. 29 Juniors scored a Composite of 18 or higher (45%) 44 Juniors raised their composite by at least 1 point from the Fall (69%) In Math, students are showing the most trouble with Functions and Modeling. In Science, the biggest concerns are in the Evaluation of Models, Inferences & Experimental Results, and Scientific Investigation. In English students are struggling with Conventions of Standard English. In Reading, students are having issues with Key Ideas & Details, Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, and Understanding Complex Texts. Of the students tested, 77% are reading at a level that is below what is needed to succeed in college courses.

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.

We are below the state average on the ACT in reading with 37.5% (state 44.5), mathematics with 15.5% (state 35.3%) and science 26% (state 29.9).

Trends

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

Academically we are improving gradually. We are providing more opportunities for ACT assessments as a means to measure growth. Culturally we have made improvements by bringing the building up to date, developing houses for students to be a part of based on their interests, and surveying students to ensure they have a staff member they trust to talk with. Behavior has improved over the last two years in the level of discipline. We are now dealing with behaviors that have to do with not completing work or interruptions in class. We have reduced the number of extreme behaviors such as drugs or fighting.

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

LCHS will focus on analyzing and apply data using common assessments, daily work, STAR, and ACT results. Data will be analyzed quarterly. Students who are seen as "bumpers", meaning they are on the edge of moving up a category will be selected and focused on quarterly using research-based strategies. The curriculum is also being aligned and units revised to ensure all content is being covered. Assessments are being used to ensure student understanding.

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%.

45% of our Juniors met the benchmark in English on the ACT during Spring testing. The graduation rate is consistently above 90%.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)