

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Dixie Heights High School
Nate Niemi
3010 Dixie Hwy
Fort Mitchell, Kentucky, 41017
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/14/2020
Status: Open

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
Attachment Summary	11

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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?

1. Principal/Administration weekly meetings- Agendas
2. Principal/Counselor Monthly meetings.- Agendas
3. Instructional Learning Teams weekly PLC meetings- Agendas
4. RBTL monthly meetings- agendas
5. MTSS quarterly meetings-agendas
6. SBDM monthly council meetings-agendas

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.

Dixie continues to show good results in ACT scores; Mean Composite Score= 20.6, 57.7% met benchmark in Reading, 48.8% met benchmark in Math, 57.8% in Reading, 32.6% in science. We achieved our ELL state goal of student showing growth. Our goal state goal was 12.5% and we achieved 48.9% in 2019-20. 82% of staff view the administrative team as good leaders and 90% believe they administration has the best interest of the school in mind. 95% of the staff are at least somewhat optimistic the school culture will improve with 66% at least quite optimistic. We were just below our 4 year co-hort graduation goal of 95% with 94.1. We did meet our 5 year co-hort goal of 94.6 with 96.5.

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.

Our special education population continues to perform below expectations. We improved our % of special education failures from 41% in 2019 to 29% in 2020. Our Free and Reduced lunch population continues to fail at a higher rate than non-free and reduced. 38% of Free and Reduced lunch students failed a class in 2020, 39% failed a class in 2019. We continue to work on School Climate. Our school climate percentage was 49% favorable in the category. 95% were at least somewhat optimistic that the culture would improve.

Trends

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

We must continue to focus on three populations of students: Special Education, Free and Reduced Lunch and English Language Learners. We have structures in place to provide the support, however the pandemic has caused those structures to be modified. We continue to work on school culture for students and staff to provide an inviting atmosphere where students want to come to school because it is an exciting place to learn where they will be supported in their learning.

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](#)

KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data: Our school focus for 2020-21 has been to improve on our common assessments and using the data from the assessment to impact student learning. We are in the 2nd year of full PLC work where teachers have a common planning to have weekly meetings around the four essential questions of a PLC: 1. What do we want students to learn? (Essential Standards)2. How will we know they have learned it? (common assessments, data analysis)3. What will we do if they have not learned it? (RTI)4. What will we do if they already learned it? (enrichment)Our Instructional Learning Teams (PLC's by content) meet weekly and in all meetings discuss each of the four questions. We have been focusing on #2 with work on building common formative assessments and then analyze the date to improve instruction and student learning. Our administrative teams attend the weekly meetings to help support the work.

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%.

School leadership is gaining trust and confidence of the staff after year 2 of new principal. 90% express optimism that culture is improving We achieved our ELL state goal of student showing growth. Our goal state goal was 12.5% and we achieved 48.9% in 2019-20. Overall failure rate for the school is continuing to decrease with increased intervention work. We have reduced the number of students who have failed at least one class from 391 to 347 in 2 years. Through this work our retained students have decreased from 126 to 76 in 2 years. We have reduced our number of students who have failed multiple classes from 258 to 152, which also contributes to the lower retention rate.

Attachment Summary

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