



HCS 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts_08312020_09:29

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Henderson County
Marganna Stanley
1805 Second St
Henderson, Kentucky, 42420
United States of America

Table of Contents

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	4
Protocol	5
Current State	6
Priorities/Concerns	8
Trends	10
Potential Source of Problem	11
Strengths/Leverages	12

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?

Data results are reviewed and analyzed at district leadership level and school level as results become available. Schools share data with SBDM Councils and staffs and district shares data with school level administration and school board. School leaders and teachers analyze data within weekly PLC meetings. District leadership meets twice monthly and more frequently as needed; SBDM Councils meet monthly and school board meets at least monthly. Meetings are documented through minutes, Google docs; board meetings are streamed live as well. Internal data sources such as individual classroom data, Infinite Campus//AESOP (behavior, attendance, etc.), NWEA MAP data, ACT data, KPREP data, transition readiness data, graduation rate, district common assessments, surveys from staff and students such as Studer, Modern Learning Survey (MLS), Impact Panorama staff survey, walkthrough data, MUNIS data, and other data at the school and district level were also used. While this data can show us points in time, trends, and longitudinal information from various perspectives, there are many other aspects of our school system, such as the relationships among students and staff, that are less tangible but definitely have an impact.

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.

Henderson County Schools scored higher than state averages in nearly every category for 2019 state testing, KPREP (ES/MS/HS) and ACT (HS). For 2020 state accountability was waived due to COVID-19. While ACT is no longer the measure for proficiency at the high school level, 11th grade students who took the ACT in March 2020 were above the state average in only math at 19.0 (state 18.7). The only other state assessment completed for 2020 was ACCESS for English Learners; 25 students met the exit benchmark for that assessment. For 2019 reading, elementary students were 55.6% proficient/distinguished compared to state of 54.6%; middle school students were 64.2% P/D compared to state 59.6%; high school students were 43.8% P/D compared to state 44.5%. In math, elementary students were 64.4% P/D, and state was only 48.6%; middle school students were 62.5% P/D, and state was only 46.4%; high school students were 36.4% P/D and state was 35.3%. Ultimately, HCS met or exceeded state scores in every category at every level except in elementary writing 45.6% P/D compared to state 46.6%; middle school social studies 58.3% P/D and state 58.8%; middle school writing 31.5% P/D compared to state at 31.9%; and at high school level on reading (ACT) 43.8% P/D compared to state 44.5%. We have 2 schools categorized as 4 stars (Bend Gate Elem. and

Spottsville Elem.); all other schools are considered 3 stars. In addition both Henderson Co. High and South Middle were 4 stars and lowered due to significant gap areas of English learners and students with disabilities, respectively. North Middle also has a significant gap for students with disabilities. In 2018 we had 5 schools identified as TSI (Targeted Support and Improvement); all schools exited that status for 2019. Based on longitudinal KPREP data, from 2014 to 2019 the following significant improvements in percentages of students scoring proficient/distinguished have been made: In math at the elementary level, all students improved from 53.8% to 64.4%; Hispanic students from 45% to 52.4%; African Americans from 35.4% to 42.7%; free/reduced from 44.5% to 58.8%. In math at the middle school level, all students improved from 49.3% to 62.5%; African American students from 27% to 42.6%; Hispanic students from 49.3% to 56.1%; free/reduced lunch from 38.1% to 52.0%. In math at the high school level, all students improved from 18.9% to 36.4%; free/reduced lunch from 13.5 to 25.5%. In reading at the middle school level, all students improved from 49.1% to 64.2%; African Americans from 27.0% to 46.1%; Hispanic students from 42.8% to 56.1%; English learners from 0% to 24.1%; and free/reduced lunch from 37.3% to 55.4%. At the middle school level in social studies, all students improved from 54.7% to 58.3%; African Americans improved from 30.3% to 40.8%; and free/reduced lunch improved from 43.3% to 48.8%. In the area of writing at the elementary school level, all students improved from 40.8% to 45.6%; free/reduced lunch from 33.1% to 39.3%. At the high school level in writing, all students improved from 47% P/D to 62.6%; African American students improved from 24.4% to 45.5%; and free/reduced lunch from 32.2% to 50.9%. From the fall of 2015 to spring of 2019 5% more of our K-8 students are at/above 50th percentile in reading based on MAP from 63% to 68%; in math we have a 5% improvement from 64% to 69%. In regards to our staff in 2019, out of 448 certified staff, 48.1% had master's degrees and 27.3% had Rank I; the average years of school experience was 11.7. The percentage of first year teachers was 11.6%, and we had a teacher turnover rate of 19.1%.

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.

With COVID-19 a primary concern is student loss of learning due to lack of in-person instruction; in addition we have approximately 15% of students who have opted to participate in a virtual learning academy. Based on 2019 state testing we have 3 schools identified with significant gap areas . Those schools are HCHS for English learners and North Middle along with South Middle for students with disabilities. Both HCHS and SMS were 4 star schools and were lowered to 3 due to those gap areas. The gap areas are compared to students' performance not in those areas (i.e. English learners to non-English learners) in the content areas of reading and math. Elementary reading scores on KPREP have dropped in the percentage of P/D after several years of stagnation from 2014 -18 60.2%, 61.2%, 61.0%, 61.3% and 55.6% for 2019. Specific gap groups who are performing well below all students for 2019 are disability (27.5%); African Americans (30.8%). While reading at the middle school level for all students has shown improvement longitudinally and currently at 64.2% P/D, African Americans performing at 46.1% P/D on 2019 KPREP; English learners at 24.1% P/D and students with disabilities at 23.4% P/D. High school reading assessment data are based on ACT scores for 2018 and 2019 so comparing longitudinally is not possible; however, there was nearly a 5% decrease in students scoring P/D from 48.7% to 43.8%. Concerns include African Americans performing at 22.2% P/D and students with disabilities at 9.4% P/D. At the elementary level in math, the percentage of all students scoring P/D for 2019 was 64.4%; subpopulations of concern include African Americans at 42.7%, English learners at 47.1%, and students with disabilities at 31.8%. In middle school math, all students are at 62.5% P/D; African Americans are at 42.6%; English learners at 31.0%; students with disabilities at 16.7%. At the high school level in math, the ACT was used in 2018 and 2019 for math proficiency. While 43.0% of all students students scored P/D in 2018, only 36.4% scored P/D in 2019. 13.6% of African Americans, 23.1% of Hispanics, and 3.8% of students with disabilities scored P/D. Proficiency in the content area of science at all levels is a concern as overall our percentages for students P/D is much lower than other content areas. While there were gains at both the elementary and middle school levels, the high school decreased in percentage from 33.9% to 31.9%. At elementary school, only 34.2% scored P/D. At

the middle school level, only 29.5% scored P/D%); disability (3.1%). Subpopulations are concerns as in other content areas. In 2018 elementary social studies, our scores overall dropped to their lowest in 5 years with 58.9% of all students scoring P/D and were lower in 2019 at 58.7%. High school level did not test social studies in 2018 or 2019. In 2018 elementary writing, our scores overall dropped to their lowest in 5 years with 34.7% of all students scoring P/D and rebounded some to 45.6% in 2019; African Americans (25.5%); Hispanics (29%)English learners (22.2%); disabilities (22%). In contrast middle school had its highest percentage of P/D for all students with 50.5% in 2018 and dropped to 31.5% for 2019, lowest in 6 years; groups of concern are African Americans (18.4%); disability (11.3%). High school writing all students had their highest percentage in 6 years (62.6%); groups English learners (25.0%); disability (14.3%).

Trends

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

Our reading performance has become somewhat stagnant as reflected in multiple pieces of data at various levels (KPREP, MAP) and how we are addressing that is discussed in leverages. With the new state assessment and accountability system, our trends in areas for academic improvement for specific groups of students is evident and documented in priorities and concerns.

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](#)

One of the primary areas of focus for our district is primary reading. We have included district and school leadership, instructional coaches, and classroom teachers in an extensive project which includes research, data analysis, and professional learning. This group created a district-wide common assessment to be used with all students in grades K-3 beginning in 2017-18 to determine specific strengths and areas for improvement with individual students, grade levels, and school/district wide. In addition, we added a district reading specialist position in 2017-18 . After two years of implementation the district assessment is now being used within RTI. We have focused on the 5 components of reading in instruction, with model teachers demonstrating and videotaping lessons for school/district leadership and teachers. Leadership is monitoring through observations. In addition we are focusing on our gap groups as we know this is an area of need in improving academic performance for all students in all content areas by increasing proficiency. District leadership meets with each school individually to analyze data, keep abreast of current information regarding assessment and accountability and determine areas of strength and need to which the district can provide support and assistance. During 2019-20 a district committee of teachers, school and district leaders reviewed curriculum and chose a new literacy series which will be implemented in 2020-21.

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%.

Transition readiness is the expectation as we are working to build a better HCS graduate; emphasis on soft skills and essential workplace readiness skills; community focused; early identification of student needs(special education, gifted, RTI, basic needs); steady progress in math achievement; systematic RTI across all schools; strong literacy foundation; differentiation in classroom instruction; accessible curriculum; a strong bond among all levels (elementary, middle, high, district) - good relationships; completion of new school project (elementary school fall 2018) and in process of another new elementary school (completion fall 2021); use of funds for multiple projects with Nickel Tax funds; district broadening scope of student needs; each school is fostering a culture of ownership; transition readiness well above state average; use of Math in Focus-- curriculum and alignment; community support and Colonels to College as valuable resources; district provides instructional coaches at each school; professional learning for all teachers and staff; district-wide staff appreciation night with food, games, prizes; district-wide Ultimate Challenge Events among schools to foster relationships through staff engagement and promote health/ wellness; use of social media; implementation for 1:1 initiative achieved at grades K-12 with addition of many technological resources and professional learning opportunities; addition of 4 digital learning coaches positions; communication with families and community through social media at school/ district levels. To sustain these areas of strength, we will focus on our people and our climate/ culture. By embedding continuous professional learning, we will also build capacity within our schools/district and focus on recruitment and retention of quality staff members. We will continue celebrations and recognition as we model transparency and innovation. We know that continued communication and vertical alignment are keys for district improvement as a whole. There is cause to celebrate our academic success as well as our progress in moving to be more technologically innovative. We use social media to "get the word out" about our individual schools. We consistently celebrate our people and their accomplishments and achievements. Another opportunity for improvement has been to improve school safety by installing Ident-akid software and hardware requiring all visitors to provide photo identification; the software is linked to law enforcement data bases to identify any potential dangers to the school, and in 2019 all schools will have secure vestibules installed where visitors

must be buzzed into the school. 2020 is the completion of our first 5-year strategic plan and so work will continue with Studor to implement a new strategic plan for our district also.

Attachment Summary

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