



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools - North Oldham HS

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

North Oldham High School
Craig Wallace
1815 S. Hwy 1793
Goshen, Kentucky, 40026
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	6
Priorities/Concerns	7
Trends	8
Potential Source of Problem	9
Strengths/Leverages	10

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?

Several groups containing principals, coaches and teachers will meet throughout the school year to monitor the results. Those teams include our SBDM Council, school administrative leadership, Guiding Coalition, Tier I data team, lead teachers, student support teams and other collaborative groups. Council's meetings are documented through the minutes that are kept. The agendas for the principal meetings, Tier I, Tier III and Guiding Coalition meetings are kept as Google docs within a Google team drive. Some groups meet weekly, others every two weeks and some once per month.

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.

ACT Reading - 76.9% of juniors met the proficiency benchmark up from 76.3%.ACT Reading (SWD) - % PD grew from 27.3 to 55.0 decreasing our gap from 49.0 points to 23.9 points.ACT Reading (Poverty) - % PD fell from 63.2 to 60.0 increasing our gap from 11.9 points to 18.0 points.ACT Math - 70.7% of juniors met the proficiency benchmark.ACT Math (SWD) - % PD grew from 18.2 to 26.3 decreasing our gap from 54.5 points to 48.1 points.ACT Math (Poverty) - % PD fell from 50.0 to 40.0 increasing our gap from 22.1 points to 32.7 points.

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.

Students with Disabilities - ACT Reading (SWD) - % PD grew from 27.3 to 55.0 decreasing our gap from 49.0 points to 23.9 points. - ACT Math (SWD) - % PD grew from 18.2 to 26.3 decreasing our gap from 54.5 points to 48.1 points. - ODW (SWD) % PD grew from 20.0 to 30.0 however our gap increased from 45.3 points to 46.2 points.

Trends

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

Our composite increased 0.2 points to 23.7 which is tied for our second highest average composite in the 10+ years Kentucky has given the ACT to every junior. This class along with the three previous have been our highest scoring groups. Closing the achievement gap for our students with disabilities continues to be an area of focus for we have never made significant inroads to create a trend in the positive direction.

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](#)

Create and implement a co-taught teaching model in our resource math classes to offer increased levels of support for students who struggle the most in math. Create and implement a pull-out program in the area of reading intervention (using LLI curriculum) for students who are several grade levels behind in reading. Increase focus on writing school-wide by creating and implementing a new plan. Continue to provide additional time in content areas for students to grow their skills required for success on the ACT. Try to build a master schedule that keeps as many co-teaching partners together as possible each year.

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%.

ACT - Although we didn't make significant gains during the 2020 administration (just a slight increase of 0.2), our trend data suggests that the last four junior classes were our top scoring testing groups in the eleven-year history of the state administration. Graduation Rate - We continue to have a very high graduation rate but are constantly working to provide new, creative opportunities for our students who need different pathways to earn all 22 credits required for graduation.

Attachment Summary

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