

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts19.20

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Covington Independent
Alvin L. Garrison
25 E Seventh St
Covington, Kentucky, 41011
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/31/2019
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?

District Leadership Team comprised of the Superintendent, both assistant superintendents, Elementary and Secondary Director, Personnel Director, Finance Director and District Assessment Coordinator meet on a weekly basis. This team meets on a weekly basis and will review both academic data and non-academic data - sign in sheets and minutes District leadership team consisting of principals, assistant principals, instructional coaches and district leaders. This team meets on a monthly basis. This team will review data such as state assessment data, STAR data, DIBELS data and common embedded assessment data. From August until first week of November this team looks at state assessment data in order to map out our plans to identify our needs as a district and individual school. These meetings are documented by agendas and sign in sheets. Focus Visit Teams- Every 60-90 days the district does a school based focus visit for each school in the district. The district collects observation data, interview data on leadership team, survey data from teachers and administration. After each visit the school creates a 30-60-90 also follow up meetings to go over data and create 30-60-90 day plans Meetings with principals and coaches - interviews School surveys - PLC Site based councils for each school - monthly - agendas and minutes Board of Education - State test results, STAR, DIBELS, ACT, Brigance

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.

See attachments - explanations of what is attached below. 1. NAPD percent by grade level 17-18 vs 18-19- this report shows the proficiency levels of students in all KPREP 2. District Reading and Math NAPD Data by Level- this report shows the number of students at each level (NAPD) broken down by All Students, White, AA, Hispanic, Two or more races, English Learners, Economically Disadvantaged and students with IEPs. These reports are broken down by Elementary, Middle School and High School in both Reading and Math. 3. Our Non- Academic report includes a Teacher Qualifications Report and District Behavior Data for 18-19- both of these reports were reported to our district school report card .

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

-  [Behavior Data 18-19](#)
-  [District Data for 2019-20 CDIP](#)
-  [NAPD percent by grade level 17-18 vs 18-19 results](#)
-  [Teacher qualification report](#)

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.

At the elementary level (3-5) our reading proficiency was 49.6 and the state average was 54.6. At the middle school level (6-8) our reading proficiency was 34.6 and the state average was 59.6. At the high school level (11) our reading proficiency was 17.4 and the state average was 44.5. At the elementary level (3-5) our math proficiency was 39.2 and the state average was 48.6. At the middle school level (6-8) our math proficiency was 22.5 and the state average was 48.6. At the high school level (11) our math proficiency was 17.7 and the state average was 48.6.

Trends

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

Our reading proficiency declined for all students in all tested grade levels except for 3rd grade. Our math proficiency declined for all students in all tested grade levels except for 7th grade.

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](#)

See attached document

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name



Key Core Work Process#1







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%.

At the elementary level in reading and math for economically disadvantaged students Covington's proficiency levels were higher than the state averages. Reading proficiency at the elementary level for economically disadvantaged students was 49.6 in Covington to 45.8 at the state level. In math 39.2 percent proficient in Covington and at the state level 39.0.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 Behavior Data 18-19	The Behavior Data report shows behavior events by grade, by location, by context, discipline resolutions and legal sanctions.	•
 District Data for 2019-20 CDIP	This data shows our reading and math proficiency numbers at the Elementary, Middle and High School by separate demographics and sub populations. (identified gap groups)	•
 Key Core Work Process#1		•
 NAPD percent by grade level 17-18 vs 18-19 results	NAPD percent by grade level 17-18 vs 18-19 results. Percentages for NAPD for grade levels 3,4,5,6,7, 8 and 11.	•
 Special Ed. and EL Data over the past 5 years		•
 Teacher qualification report	This report shows different qualifications our teachers have including years of service, degrees, National Board Certification and also teacher turnover numbers.	•