

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts for SCPS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Shelby County Public Schools

James Neihof
1155 W Main St
Shelbyville, Kentucky, 40065
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/12/2019

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts	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
Attachment Summary	11

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

2019-20 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 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 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 school/district councils, leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

At the district level, a Continuous Improvement Committee convenes in September to begin reviewing and analyzing data results. The Board of Education appoints one board member to be a part of the team during the first September Board Meeting. Other members include the following roles: Chief Academic Officer, Superintendent, Director of Curriculum Personalization, Staff Developer, Elementary Principal/Designee, Middle School Principal/Designee, High School Principal/Designee, Director of Special Education, Director of College and Career Education, Digital Learning Coordinator, Special Education Coordinator, RTI Coordinator & District Assessment Coordinator. After state accountability data is released, the committee convenes every 2 weeks to complete a needs assessment and begin to create a plan to meet the needs addressed and the goals for the next year. The committee considers both academic and non-academic data as well as the goals and objectives of the 4 year district Strategic Leadership Plan.

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 74% of the district's teachers received adequate professional development.

Non-Academic Current State: 1. The number of behavior referrals (events) increased from 1, 263 in 2017-18 to 1, 337 in 2018-19, that is a 6% increase (See attachment Behavior Analysis 17/18 and 18/19). 2. 100% of all Shelby County schools that were eligible for PBIS silver status in 18/19 obtained it. 100% of all Shelby County Public Schools became PBIS bronze status 18/19 as well. 3. Advisory structure is evident in all schools. Academic Current State: 1. 71.2% of 2019 SCPS Graduates were Transition Ready per the KDE District Report Card (see attachment for Acad./ Career and school level breakdown) 2. The SCPS Graduation Rate for 2018-19 was 91.9% per the KDE District Report Card (SCHS: 91.4%/MLCHS 92.2%) 3. Proficiency: Reading: Elem-45.2% Middle-52.9% High-41.6%; Math: Elem-41.4% Middle-36% High-25.7% 4. Separate Academic Indicator - The District Separate Academic Indicator Rating derived from KPREP performance in Social Studies, Science and Writing is: Elementary is 56.5 (Low); Middle is 56.6 (Low); High is 55.4 (Low). 5. Growth - For the 2018-19 school year, Shelby County Public Schools KPREP data shows the we are growing at a slight rate above the state average at the Elementary level: 59.8 out of 300 (medium growth)/State: 57.7/300 (Medium Growth). At the Middle School level, we are growing at a rate just below the state average: Middle School level: 52.3/300 (Medium Growth)/State: 52.5/300 (medium Growth). See attachment KPREP Growth. 6. Gap - Elementary has the largest gap with economically disadvantaged students (26.7). Middle has the largest gaps with SWD (38.3) and ELL (41.1) groups. High has the largest gaps with AA (33.4) and HISP (27.4) groups. SWD is the group with the largest gap with a range of 30.7-38.3 across levels.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

-  [18-19 SCPS Transition Readiness by Sub Group](#)
-  [2018-19 KPREP Growth Data](#)
-  [Behavior Analysis SCPS 17/18](#)
-  [Behavior Analysis SCPS 18-19](#)
-  [Historical Disproportionality](#)

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 Districts.

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.

High numbers of students with disabilities (SWD) continue to score in the novice range. In reading, 49.5% elementary, 58.3% middle and 62% high school SWD scored novice. Percentage of SWD who did not show growth on KPREP Reading: Elem-48%; Middle-46%. In math, 50.5% elementary, 45.7% middle and 68.6% high school SWD scored novice. Percentage of SWD who did not show growth on KPREP Math: Elem-44.2%; Middle-41.8%. In writing, 62.9% elementary, 60.3% middle, and 32.1% high school SWD scored novice. 40.9% of students identifying as Hispanic/Latino were Transition Ready in 2019 compared to 71.2 average for SCPS. This is a 30.3% gap for this sub group. 52.4% of students identifying as Low Socio-Economic Status were Transition Ready in 2019 compared to 71.2 average for SCPS. This is a 18.8% gap for this sub group. Reading: 49.5% elementary, 58.3% middle, and 62% of high school students with disabilities scored novice on the KPREP test. Science: 81% at 4th grade, 80% at grade 7, and 77% at grade 11 are performing below proficiency. Math: 50.5%

Trends

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

Disabilities Novice 2017-18 . R - M 2018-19 . R - M
 Elem . 44.6 - 48.5 49.5 - 50.5 Middle 53.1 - 50.3
 58.3 - 45.7 HS 70.8 - 71.8 62.0 - 68.6
 This table shows an increase in novice in 3 out of 6 areas from 17/18 to 18/19. In 2018, 48.6% of students identifying as Hispanic/Latino were Transition Ready and in 2018-19 that percentage dropped to 40.9%. Both years represent a need for improvement, but it is noted that the percentage Transition Ready declined by 7.7% in 2018-19. In 2018, 63.6% of English Learners graduated with their 4-year cohort (64.3% with 5-year cohort) compared to 72.3% of English Learners graduating with their 2019 4-year cohort. (68.3% with 5-year cohort) This was an increase of 8.7% for this 2019 subgroup but it remains an area of need. In 2018, 66% of Students with Disabilities graduated with their 4-year cohort (91.2% with 5-year cohort) compared to 85.1% of Students with Disabilities graduated with their 2019 4-year cohort. (78.3 with 5-year cohort) This was an increase of 8.7% for the 4 year-cohort (11.3% increase for 5-year cohort) for this subgroup but it remains an area of need.

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](#)

1. We are focused on KCWP 3: Designing and Delivering Assessment Literacy. Specifically, we are working on moving from a grading culture to a learning culture. 2. Transition Readiness for students identifying as Hispanic/Latino: KCWP4 and KCW5. The Advisory system, new in 2019-20, at each high school will provide a culture and place for support of Transition Readiness. In addition, EL Certified teachers at each high school will use data and scheduling options to advocate for student Transition Readiness. 3. KCWP 1 & 2 for Science: The district is creating Science Curriculum and mastery scales aligned to NGSS standards. Currently, some teachers lack the knowledge and skill to effectively implement the NGSS standards. 4. KCWP 1, 2 & 3: Principals and instructional coaches are supporting teachers in the use of district curriculum, best practices in literacy and math and assessment literacy. 5. KCWP 5: Low expectations for students with disabilities and a need for professional learning in co-teaching as well as specially designed instruction in basic reading and writing strategies. .

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%.

1. Adaptive Learning System usage/growth connected to test data
2. Increasing Transition Readiness percentage for students identifying as Hispanic/Latino: Based on School level board reports in November 2018, SCPS Board of Education responded to the need by approving the hire of additional certified EL instructors. New in 2019-20 we have two EL certified teachers in each high school that will provide additional support toward achievement of Transition Readiness. District College/Career personnel will work with the EL Certified staff to ensure they have resources and information needed to support student success.
3. High growth in elementary math
4. SWD increased in the percent proficient/distinguished in elementary math, middle reading and high school reading. In 2018, 66% of Students with Disabilities graduated with their 4-year cohort compared to 85.1% of Students with Disabilities who graduated with their 2019 4-year cohort.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 18-19 SCPS Transition Readiness by Sub Group		•
 2018-19 KPREP Growth Data		•
 Behavior Analysis SCPS 17/18		•
 Behavior Analysis SCPS 18-19		•
 Historical Disproportionality		•