



2020-21 Madison Co Schools Phase Two: The Needs Assessment
for Districts_09022020_10:07

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Madison County
David Gilliam
301 Highland Park Dr
Richmond, Kentucky, 40475
United States of America

Table of Contents

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement	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 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 district leadership team that analyzes and evaluates student achievement data consists of the Superintendent, Chief Academic Officer, the District Assessment Coordinator, Director of Districtwide Services and Academic Support, Direction of Professional Learning, Director of Instructional Technology, Director of Special Education, and Director of Pre-schools. This team analyzes and evaluates summative state data and formative diagnostic data (3x/year). Decisions regarding curriculum selection, program selection and funding, and professional learning plans are made based on the data analysis. While this team meet regularly (monthly), data analysis occurs when data is released and available after assessment completion.

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.

58% of elementary students scored Proficient/Distinguished in Reading on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment. 47.8% of elementary students scored Proficient/Distinguished in Mathematics on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment. 67.2% of middle school students scored Proficient/Distinguished in Reading on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment. 49.6% of middle school students scored Proficient/Distinguished in Mathematics on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment. 49.3% of high school students scored Proficient/Distinguished in Reading on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment. 37.8% of high school students scored Proficient/Distinguished in Mathematics on the 2018-19 KPREP assessment.

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.

Free/Reduced students vs. All Students: Scored 10.1% lower in Reading on the 2018-19 elementary KPREP assessment Scored 11.4% lower in Mathematics on the 2018-19 elementary KPREP assessment Scored 10.2% lower in Reading on the 2018-19 middle school KPREP assessment Scored 11.4% lower in Mathematics on the 2018-19 middle school KPREP assessment Scored 15.1% lower in Reading on the 2018-19 high school KPREP assessment Scored 11.9% lower in Mathematics on the 2018-19 high school KPREP assessment African American Students vs. All Students: Scored 19.2% lower in Reading on the 2018-19 elementary KPREP assessment Scored 18.2% lower in Mathematics on the 2018-19 elementary KPREP assessment Scored 20.5% lower in Reading on the 2018-19 middle school KPREP assessment Scored 25.3% lower in Mathematics on the 2018-19 middle school KPREP assessment Scored 18.3% lower in Reading on the 2018-19 high school KPREP assessment Scored 21.1% lower in Mathematics on the 2018-19 high school KPREP assessment District behavior data indicates the need for schools to continue with PBIS and school safety monitors.

Trends

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

Reviewing KPREP data from 2018 through 2019 the following trends emerge: In subcategories, the data shows that minority students consistently score lower than white students across the board Free/Reduced students consistently score lower than non-gap students.

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](#)

Deployment of Standards and Delivery of Instruction will continue to be the focus of structures and processes within in school PLCs. The district will continue to guide/ support principals and teachers in establishing a process to ensure curricular alignment reviews are an ongoing action of the PLC's planning process. Additionally, the district will guide/support principals and teachers in regularly reviewing the alignment between standards, learning targets and assessment measures. The district is very focused on the training and implementation of Jim Shipley's Continuous Classroom Improvement (CCI) systems model. Currently, approximately half of our total teaching staff is trained in the CCI systems work and are at varying levels of implementation. Teacher-Coaches and district leadership are working with all schools on the effectiveness of the system implementation. CCI includes specific work on deployment of standards and instructional delivery.

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%.

Proficiency for elementary reading for Hispanic/Latino improved from 40.5% to 42.7%. Proficiency for elementary writing for All Students improved from 56.6% to 62.8%. Proficiency for elementary Social Studies for All Students improved from 40% to 56.3%. Proficiency for middle school Social Studies for All Students improved from 69.9% to 71.8%. High School Career Readiness improved from 23% to 35%. High School Academic Readiness improved from 51% to

