2019-20 Collins Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Martha Layne Collins High School
Joseph Ellison, III
801 Discovery Blvd
Shelbyville, Kentucky, 40065
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/30/2019
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

eProve diagnostics

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.

eProve diagnostics

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?

Data review and analysis is infused in the instructional work of Martha Layne Collins High School. Course-specific PLC/data teams (comprised of common course teachers, instructional coaches, and school administrators) meet three (3) times each month to discuss common balancedassessments (formative and summative assessments aligned to state academic standards) and to determine the best instructional strategies to use in response to the data (either in intervention work or whole-class instruction). This work is documented on written data protocols, which are housed in Google Drive. Data review is completed in PLC/data teams in a spiral fashion so that the team's focus remains on all students mastering priority course standards. Remediation strategies are created and generated as a result of the PLC/data team's balanced assessment analysis. The Site-Based Decision Making Council is regularly updated on students' academic and career attainment progress through reports from the principal in regular, monthly meetings. A comprehensive review of the K-PREP data, ACT data, and Transition Readiness data are conducted when that data is first received. The school's administrative team meets weekly and focuses two meetings a month on school academic data and developing ways to best support teachers' responses to student-level data. Finally, the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meets monthly. This team is comprised of all department chairs, the administrative team, the instructional coaches, and the library/media specialist. A portion of this meeting is focused upon a review of current academic progress and discussing the supports needed by teachers to enable effective responses to student-level data.

eProve diagnostics

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.

Academic data- 42.6% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Reading proficiency assessment, as opposed to 48.1% in 2017, 39% in 2016, and 43.2% in 2015. (DECREASE OF 5.5%) The percentage of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Reading proficiency assessment in the state was 44.5%.- 27.4% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Math proficiency assessment, as opposed to 39.7% in 2017, 17.5% in 2016, and 18.5% in 2015. (DECREASE OF 12.3%) The percentage of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Math proficiency assessment in the state was 35.2%.- The school's Proficiency index is 53.2, compared to state average of 56.8 (3.6 below the state).- The school's Separate Academic Indicator index is 53.8, compared to state average of 62 (8.2 below the state).- The school's Transition Readiness index is 79, compared to state average of 66.8 (12.2 above the state).- The school's Graduation Rate is 92.2%, compared to state average of 91.1% (1.1% above the state).- 18.4 average composite ACT score compared to state average of 19.0 in 2018, a decrease of 1.3 points.Non-Academic Data- Overall average student attendance in school year 2018-19 was 94.68%.- Behavior referrals increased by 75 (from 1572 to 1847) n school year 2018-19.- In school year 2018-19, 56% of students had zero behavioral infractions; 22% had 1-2 behavioral infractions; 7% had 3-4 behavioral infractions.- The most common behavioral infractions in school year 2018-19 were for skipping class (31%), tardy to class (21%) , and disruptive behavior (11%).- 1119 students participated in the Fall, 2018 Golden Ticket Reward (to celebrate good behavior choices).- 1116 students participated in the Spring, 2019 Golden Ticket Reward (to celebrate good behavior choices).

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 school's Proficiency index is 53.2, compared to state average of 56.8 (3.6 below the state). - 42.6% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Reading proficiency assessment (35.9% novice and 21.5% apprentice). - 27.3% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Math proficiency assessment (30.1% novice and 42.6% apprentice).- The school's Separate Academic Indicator index is 53.8, compared to state average of 62 (8.2 below the state). - 21.2% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Science assessment (31% novice and 47.8% apprentice). - 43.1% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Writing assessment (23.1% novice and 33.7% apprentice).

Priorities/Concerns

e|Prove diagnostics

Trends

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

- 42.6% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Reading proficiency assessment, as opposed to 48.1% in 2017, 39% in 2016, and 43.2% in 2015 (DECREASE OF 5.5% from 2017). The percentage of all students scoring proficient/distinguished on the Reading proficiency assessment in the state was 44.5%. Current data and 2017 data is rooted in the Reading section of the ACT.- 27.4% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Math proficiency assessment, as opposed to 39.7% in 2017, 17.5% in 2016, and 18.5% in 2015 (DECREASE OF 12.3% from 2017). The percentage of all students scored proficient/distinguished on the Math proficiency assessment in the state was 35.2%. Current data and 2017 data is rooted in the Math section of the ACT.

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](#)

Math- Provide students more exposure to ACT-like questions and released test items (KCWP3)- Use Advisory period to enhance general testing skills/strategies and provide specific content support (based on common classroom assessments and practice ACT results) (KCWP3, KCWP4, KCWP5)- Increase students' proficiency in basic math skills using a calculator (KCWP2)Reading- Adjust entry points to standards to enhance students' success (KCWP2)- Use Advisory period to enhance general testing skills/strategies and provide specific content support (based on common classroom assessments and practice ACT results) (KCWP3, KCWP4, KCWP5)- Provide students more exposure to ACT-like questions and released test items (KCWP3)Science- Use Advisory period to enhance general testing skills/strategies and provide specific content support (based on common classroom assessments and practice ACT results) (KCWP3, KCWP4, KCWP5)- Develop common, cross-curricular reading and writing approaches/frames (KCWP1, KCWP2)Writing- Develop common, cross-curricular reading and writing approaches/frames (KCWP1, KCWP2)- Adjust entry points to standards to enhance students' success (KCWP2)- Create and implement On-Demand Writing bootcamp to strengthen tested writing skills and develop a common vocabulary for writing (KCWP3)- Strategically group students for writing workshops to build writing skill (KCWP2)

Potential Source of Problem

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%.

- Percentage of Hispanic or Latino scoring proficient/distinguished increased .5% in Reading (from 25.6% to 26.1%).- Percentage of English Learners with Monitoring scoring proficient/distinguished increased 4.8% in Reading (from 0% to 4.8%).- Percentage of Disability with IEP scoring proficient/ distinguished increased 12.5% in Reading (from 0% to 12.5%).- Percentage of Disability with IEP scoring proficient/distinguished increased .7% in Science (from 3.1% to 3.8%).- Percentage of Disability with IEP scoring proficient/distinguished increased 7.7% in Writing (from 0% to 7.7%).- Proficiency indicator was 0.8 points from "medium" rating (next level).- Transition Readiness indicator was 1 point from "high" rating (next level).- Graduation Rate indicator was 0.8 points from "medium" rating (next level).

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)

eProve diagnostics