



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_10292020_16:24

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Holmes High School
Tony Magner
25th & Madison
Covington, Kentucky, 41014
United States of America

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

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?

Assessment data is reviewed, analyzed, and applied through a variety of ways at Holmes High School. The yearly state assessment data from the 18-19 school year due to COVID-19 is compiled and put into an easy to read format by the district assessment coordinator. This information is shared with teachers through large group staff meetings then reviewed in greater detail during instructional lead meetings. Instructional leads then share this data in smaller PLC meetings with their departments. The instructional leads work with PLC groups to further review, analyze, and apply the local data, such as common assessments, Lexia Power Up Data and Star data, collected to guide their instructional planning. Teachers work with students to set individual goals based on their data during Team Time, a scheduled intervention time to address social/emotional needs and reading skills. Data from the IMPACT survey is shared during staff meetings and activities related to improving school culture are also conducted with the entire staff. We have a site based decision making committee charged with improving the climate and culture of the school. Attendance and behavior data are discussed in a variety of committees. The Student Success Team meets monthly to review individual student data to determine interventions to provide support. There is also a monthly behavior data review conducted with our DOJ data team to look for school wide trends that need to be addressed through additional training or structure. The monthly data is shared with staff via our electronic platform. All teams and committees involved with the review of data meet monthly with the exception of the PLC groups who meet two times each month. The planning and PD committee is made up of teachers, counselors, academic and career coaches, administrators, and parents.

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.

Academic: Students scored a composite of 16.6 on ACT, compared to 16.1 in 2019. Students scored 15.3 on the English portion of the ACT, compared to 14.7 in 2019. Students scored 16.4 on the Math portion of the ACT, compared to 16.1 in 2019. Students scored 16.7 on the Reading portion on the ACT, compared to 16.2 in 2019. Students scored 17.2 on the Science portion on the ACT, compared to 16.7 in 2019. Non-academic The number of behavior referrals decreased from 696 during the 18-19 school year to 558 during the 19-20 school year, although we were virtual for the last 2 months of school with no behavior referrals. The average yearly teacher attendance for 19-20 school year increased from 84.9% to 95.33%.

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 priorities remain our ELL learners and our students with disabilities. Current scores are not available - here are scores from the previous year: 82.4% of our Hispanic students scored novice in ACT reading compared to an overall school average of 60.9%. 73.9% of our students with disabilities scored novice in ACT math compared to an overall school average of 50%. 81.8% of our English language learners scored novice in ACT math compared to an overall school average of 50%. 54.5% of our English language learners scored novice on K-Prep on-demand writing compared to an overall school average of 25.2%. 66.7% of our students with disabilities scored novice on K-Prep on-demand writing compared to an overall school average of 25.2%.

Trends

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

The performance of our English language learners and students with disabilities remains an ongoing area of concern in all assessed content. Adequate coverage for teachers who are absent is an area of concern in regard to the culture of the building. Improved implementation of tier 1 and tier 2 behavior interventions is an identified growth area as well. Tier 1 academic intervention is an area of growth for our school.

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](#)

We will work to ensure vertical curriculum mapping is occurring through attending monthly I-team meetings and PLC meetings. PLC groups will also ensure the review of standards alignment, learning targets and common assessments is taking place. The Foundations committee, a group consisting of teachers, security staff, a counselor, and administrators, will work to improve staff knowledge of positive supports and tier 1 behavior interventions. Counselors and building level administrators will ensure students are receiving appropriate tier 2 interventions as determined by the student support team.

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%.

Our 4 year cohort graduation rate decreased slightly from 91.3% in 2018-19 school year to 84.9% in 2019-20. Our transition readiness index increased from 32.7 in 2017-18 to 61.1 in 2018-19. This data due to COVID-19 pandemic is not available for the 19-20 school year.

Attachment Summary

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