



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_09272020_20:03

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Bell Central School Center
Jennifer Blankenship
9821 Highway 25-E
Pineville, Kentucky, 40965
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	7
Priorities/Concerns	9
Trends	10
Potential Source of Problem	11
Strengths/Leverages	12

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?

When we receive the data from our state assessment staff begin working to dissect the data. We work with our central office DAC - Angela Allen to calculate all parts of our scores. Staff members calculate the percentages of N, A, P, and D in every area, look at our GAP groups, add the new year of data to our previous years data to look at trends in order to see how we have improved or regressed and to help us see where we are going and what changes we need to make to get there. We discuss our areas for improvements as well as our celebration points. We identify students who were within 5 points of the next performance levels and then of course we look at our novice students and begin creating plans to move these students to proficiency. We look at those students who are proficient and make plans to move them to distinguished. When we create our plans we then create a plan for monitoring and making sure the plans are implemented. This year due to COVID 19 things are much different. We do not have Spring MAP scores or KPREP data. We are using the last KPREP assessments as well as winter MAP data. The shareholders were selected by their roles in our school. We wanted to be sure that all areas of our school were represented. We have to go along with our principal and assistant principal the following: Our school counselor, librarian, primary teacher, intermediate teacher, middle school teacher, who are different subjects . We also have our Youth Service Center director, special needs teacher as well as two SBDM teacher members, our attendance clerk as well as a parent. Several of the members are parents as well as have other roles in the building. The principal and assistant principal discuss with each stakeholder to explain why they were selected and how we wanted a committee that would well represent all areas of our school community. The meetings will be held at various times to meet all needs. We will have meetings after school and. The assistant principal will record the minutes of the meeting as well as create timelines to insure all actions are implemented and monitored for effectiveness. The principal will check minutes of meetings and monitor actions to ensure implementation. The meetings will begin with all actions that have taken place since the meeting prior. Jennifer Blankenship - Principal Susan Brock - Assistant Principal Kara Davis - Counselor Heather Cornett- Librarian Myra Miracle - Attendance Clerk Lesa Straup - Youth Service Center Coordinator Trina Fuson - Special Education Teacher/SBDM member Katrina Goodnight - Intermediate Teacher/SBDM member Deanna Farmer - Kindergarten Teacher Jessica Winkler - Parent Thomas Heck - Middle School Teacher Amy Woolum - Primary Teacher

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.

Our current academic state: This information is from 2018/2019 school year - 3rd grade KPREP reading: • 46.4% of students scoring at proficient • The % of proficient went down from 54% to 46.4% • We have 18 novices here and 55.5% of students scored A/N 4th grade KPREP reading: • 58% of students are scoring at N/A • 40.9% of students scoring proficient 5th grade KPREP reading: • 47.4 % of students are scoring at N/A • 19.4% more students are scoring at n/a than in 2017/2018 In elementary reading 47.4% of students scored at P/D in the 2019 school year, which is a decrease from last year by 2.6%. More students are scoring at N/A. • Elementary Social Studies students were at 73.8% P/D a .2% increase from 2018. • Elementary Writing students were at 57.4% P/D, a decrease of 12.4% from 2018. • Elementary Science were at 23.1% p/d, a decrease of 6.7% from 2018. In reading the ED (economically disadvantaged group) scored 41.1% proficient and the NED (non economically disadvantaged group) scored 61.2% proficient (20 point gap) In reading The disabilities group scored 40.5% proficient and non disabilities group scored 49.6% proficient. (9 point gap) 6th Grade Reading – • N – 4%, a decrease of 5% • P/D – 76% an increase of 7.8% 7th Grade Reading – • P/D - 65% a decrease of 17% from 2018. • N – 2% a decrease of 1.8% from 2018. 8th Grade Reading – • P/D – 88% an increase of 11.1% from 2018. • N – 2% 76.5 % of middle school students

were P/D in reading. An increase of 1.5% from 2018. • Middle school Social studies had 81.4% P/D. • Middle school Writing had 78% P/D. • Middle school Science had 20% p/d, a decrease of 20 points from 2018. In Middle School reading the ED group was 72% P/D while the NED group was 89.8% p/d a 17pt gap. The disability group in reading was 66.7 p/d compared to the non disability group was 80% p/d a 13 point gap. 3rd Grade Math • 41% p/d • 19.6% novice 4th Grade math • 15.3% N, a 3% decrease from 2018. • 53.7% P/D, an increase of 6.7% from 2018. 5th Grade math • 18% N • 44.1% P/D Elementary math in 2018 had a 1.4% increase from 44.1% P/D to 45.5%. The ED group was 39.3% p/d compared to the NED group who was 59.2% p/d a 20 point gap. The disability group was 56% p/d compared to the non disability group who was 81.6% a 13.3% gap. 6th grade Math • 6% Novice, a decrease from 1.3% in 2017. • 70% P/D, an increase of 7 from 2017 7th grade math • 7.5% N an increase of 2% from 2017. • 55% P/D 8th grade math • 9.6% N • 66% P/D, an increase of 6.5% from 2017. Middle school math ED group scored 56% p/d compared to the NED who scored 81.6% p/d a 15 point gap. Middle school math disability group scored 58.3% p/d compared to the non disability group who scored 65.6% p/d a 7 point gap. Non academic state: -The number of behavior referrals decreased from 120 in 2017-18 to 102 in 2018-19. -Our free and reduced % is % -Our staff attendance for 2019/2020 was %74.9 -According to our 2020 Impact study 60% of teachers favor that they receive enough feedback and coaching, therefore 40% indicate that they need more feedback and coaching. 54% of teachers believe they need more resources available; such as updated technology, they spend alot on their own classroom and more specialists to help students.

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.

3rd grade reading has over 32% of students scoring at Novice. 53.5% scoring at N/A and 46.4% scoring at proficiency level. 4th grade reading has 23% of students scoring at Novice. 57% are scoring at N/A and 40% of students are scoring at proficiency level. These areas have the most number of Novice and least number of P/D. 3rd grade math has 19.6% of Novice and 41% of students scoring at proficiency. Looking at the economically disadvantaged gap group compared to the non economically disadvantaged group there is a 20 point gap in reading and math for both groups at the elementary level.

Trends

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

Elementary reading is a significant area for improvement. Looking at the data over the last 2 academic years it shows a decrease in the % of students scoring novice - 2018 25% and 2019 23.7% The % of students scoring at proficiency is decreasing 2018 50% and 2019 47.3%.

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](#)

The school will focus its resources and efforts upon the deployment of standards in elementary reading. Our current reading program allows us no way of tracking who's teaching what standards when and to whom with the changing of classes based on the child's reading group. We began creating a plan to ensure the appropriate core content is being taught to the correct group of students. We will build on this and continue to focus all our resources upon this area.

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%.

Our strengths -Our middle school is a 5 star school and 2nd in the state with an overall score of 80.1. Our middle school's proficiency indicator is very high at 90.9, separate academic indicator is very high at 84.2 and our growth indicator is very high at 66.3. Our reading was 9th in the state, writing was 3rd in the state, social studies was 8th in the state and math at 30th in the state. In Separate Academic Indicators on the 2018 KPREP for elementary --•Social Studies students were at 73% P/D and 3.7 % N. •Writing students were at 69% P/D and 9.4% N. •Both of these areas saw an increase from 2017. In Separate Academic Indicators on the 2018 KPREP for middle school – Middle school separate academic indicators on KPREP

Attachment Summary

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