



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Oldham County

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Oldham County
Greg Schultz
6165 W. Highway 146
Crestwood, Kentucky, 40014
United States of America

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	8
Trends	10
Potential Source of Problem	11
Strengths/Leverages	12

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?

The leadership teams at each of our 19 schools review academic, behavioral and attendance data through the lens of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) to inform their work with students. Members of each school leadership team include the principal, one or more assistant principals, counselors and an instructional coach. Each school's leadership team meet bi-weekly to review data available in infinite campus (and from NWEA MAP each quarter) and then allocates resources at the building level. The analysis of student performance data informs how students are placed in tiered intervention groups, enrolled in behavioral intervention programming and supported in each of their classes through high-quality core instruction. At the district level, we also monitor broad trends in student performance through an MTSS lens. Our Director of Student Services tracks enrollment and attendance data on each campus, our District Intervention & 504 Coordinator monitors trends in behavioral data and collaborates with counselors and mental health consultants on each of our campuses and our elementary and secondary level directors, instructional coaches and Director of Special Education monitor trends in academic performance. Each of these district level leaders shares regular updates with their colleagues in the Student Learning Division. Information from this team, in turn, is shared with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services and the Executive Team on a monthly basis. In addition to this, each school's SBDM gives an annual presentation to the Oldham County School Board highlighting the trends in attendance, behavioral and academic data in their school. Each SBDM also shares their plan to address the needs of the students they serve.

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.

At the time of our last KPREP assessment in 2018-19, 65.9% of elementary students were proficient in reading, 62.0% were proficient in math and 61% were proficient in writing. At the middle school level, 74% of middle school students were proficient in reading, 66% were proficient in math and 39% were proficient in writing. Students with disabilities were 34.9% proficient in reading at the elementary level, 34.3% proficient at the middle school level and 39.5% proficient at the high school level. In mathematics, elementary students with disabilities were 31.6% proficient, middle school students were 23.6% proficient and high school students were 21.7% proficient. At the high school level in 2019, students had an average ACT score 21.4 in English, 21.5 in math, 22.5 in reading and 21.8 in Science with an overall composite score of 21.9. In 2019, 48.1% of African American students graduated Transition Ready, 46.2% of Hispanic Student, 22.9% of English Language Learners and 19.7% of disabled students. On our most recent NWEA Map administration in reading, 34.7% of elementary students scored in the high range, 26% in the high average range, 16.2% in the average range, 12.9% in the low average and 10.3% in the low range. At the secondary level, 30.7% of 6th to 9th grade students scored in the high range, 33.3% in the high average range, 19.9% in the average range, 13.1%

in the low average and 6.4% in the low range. On our most recent NWEA Map administration in math, 24% of elementary students scored in the high range, 28.3% in the high average range, 21.3% in the average range, 15.1% in the low average and 11.4% in the low range. At the secondary level, 31.3% of 6th to 9th grade students scored in the high range, 27.1% in the high average range, 22% in the average range, 12.6% in the low average and 7% in the low range.

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.

Critical Finding 1: Elementary Math data shows an increase in the percentage of Kindergarten students whose performance falls in the Low and Low Average range in fall of 2020 compared to the winter of 2019. In 2019, approximately 3.5 percent of Kindergarteners fell into the low range compared to 12.5% in 2019 and 8.0% of Kindergarteners fell into the Low Average range compared to 13.1% in 2020. These increases raise concerns about the impact that remote learning and the COVID-19 pandemic have had on our students' readiness to enter Kindergarten. A closer look at individual student performance data in math from the winter of 2019 to the fall of 2020 identified a number of concerning findings in Mathematics. In the area of Operations and Algebraic Thinking we identified 42% of students in 1st to 5th grade who dropped one or more performance level on their NWEA Map test (e.g. Hi Average to Average, Average to Low Average, etc.). In the area of Measurement of Data, we identified 39.8% of 1st to 5th grade students who dropped one or more performance levels. Critical Finding 2: Secondary Language Arts data shows an increase in the percentage of 6th, 7th and 8th grade students whose performance on the NWEA Map assessment fell into the Low and Low Average range in the fall of 2020 compared to the winter of 2019. 8th grade students in the Low range increased by 4.8% from 5% in 2019 to 9.8% in 2020. The number of students in the Low Average range increased by approximately 3% between 2019 and 2020. At the same time, we saw decreases in the number of students performing at the High Average and High range. We observed a drop in the percent of 6th grade students in the High range moving from 31.8% in 2019 to 24.5% in 2020, 7th grade students dropped from 34% in 2019 to 28% in 2020 and 8th grade students dropped from 31.3% on 2019 to 21.8% in 2020. A closer look at individual student performance data in ELA from the winter of 2019 to the fall of 2020 identified a number of concerning findings in Language Arts. In the area of Vocabulary Acquisition and Use, we identified 50.7% of 6th to 9th grade students who dropped one or more performance level on their NWEA Map test (e.g. Hi Average to Average, Average to Low Average, etc.) from the winter of 2019 to the fall of 2020. In Literature, 38.1% of 6th to 9th grade student dropped one or more levels and in the area of Information Texts, we identified 35.2% of students who dropped one or more levels. Critical

Finding 3: On-Demand Writing at all grade levels continues to be an area of concern. School leadership teams have developed writing plans that align to the district writing plan, but we continue to see declines in the percentages of proficiency at all levels. During the 2018-19 school year, we did see increases with on-demand writing at the elementary level, including movement towards closing the achievement gap with all subpopulations. High school showed no significant change. All but on middle school reflected a significant decline in proficiency. Critical Finding 4: Transition Readiness continues to be an area of focus at the high school level. During the 2018-19 school year, only 19.7% of disabled students graduated Transition Ready in Oldham County Schools. Our district struggles to offer and ensure students' access to courses that will provide students the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to transition to the next level of a students' career. Moving Forward: The data found in this report gives a broad overview of the challenges facing Oldham County Schools. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, our district is missing the state-wide KPREP data that we are accustomed to analyzing to measure academic progress over time. In place of these data, we have done our best to measure student academic performance using the NWEA MAP assessment. We will continue to monitor MTSS data at the building level and use winter and spring MAP assessment data to measure students progress moving forward.

Trends

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

Over the last two years, elementary mathematics and secondary language arts are content areas needing our focused attention as a district. As described in the Priorities / Concerns section of this report, we have noticed a decline in students' performance level as measured by the NWEA Map assessment in elementary mathematics and secondary language arts. Within these two focus areas, students of color, students supported through the Free / Reduced Lunch program and students supported through special education continue to underperform their peers. The achievements gaps that exist between these student groups are substantial and are worthy of our time and focused attention to close.

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](#)

We intend to focus on three areas to address the critical focus areas outlined in this report: 1. KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction 2. KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data 3. KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support

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%.

Elementary students have made noticeable improvement in English Language Arts as measured by the NWEA Map assessment. The average Percentile Rank for a student in 1st and 3rd grade grew 6 PR points from an average of 59 to 65 in 1st grade and from 56 to 62 in 3rd grade. Equally noteworthy, we saw the average Percentile Rank for 7th, 8th and 9th grade students grow in mathematics. In 7th grade the average PR grew from 57 in 2019 to 62 in 2020. 8th and 9th grade grew an average of 3 points from 62 to 65 for 8th grade students and 65 to 68 for 9th grade students. Oldham County Schools continue to have extremely high graduate rates and lead the state in overall ACT composite scores.

Attachment Summary

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