



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Districts_10192020_13:56

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Taylor County
Charles Marty Higdon Jr.
1209 E Broadway
Campbellsville, Kentucky, 42718
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	9
Potential Source of Problem	10
Strengths/Leverages	11
Attachment Summary	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?

The district comprehensive planning team is comprised of Superintendent Charles Higdon, Board Chair David Hall, Director of Schools Laura Benningfield, DAC/ Director of Schools DiAnne Harris, Director of Special Education Scott Parks, Director of Pupil Personnel Angela Cook, and all school level administrators (Melissa Long, Donna Williams, Neil Sanders, Sara Tucker, and Reece Grubbs). This team meets regularly and reports out to the board of education, all staff, and community stakeholders. Weekly the district administrative teams meets with schools during early release Fridays in large and small groups while PLCs are analyzing common unit assessment data aligned to standards as well as MAP (K-8) and CASE 21(9-11) data. All PLCs upload grade level common unit assessment data and MAP data to Shared Drives in Google Suites so that all school and district level administrators can review and analyze growth of students. Assessment and accountability data is analyzed and discussed at various levels on a regular basis: analyzed by the classroom teacher, analyzed by partner teachers, analyzed by content and grade level PLCs, analyzed by school leadership teams, analyzed by school councils, and analyzed by district leadership and the board. We are working to implement an strong and unified system within our district.

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.

Current Non-Academic State: * Student attendance has continued to show a slight decrease each of the past 4 years (95.24% for 2015-16, 95.08% for 2016-17, 94.65% for 2017-18, and 94.59% for 2018-19 – data for 2019-20 is not available due to Covid closing schools in March) * The number of minority students continues to gradually rise in the district (10% in 2017-18, 11.3% in 2018-19 and 11.7% in 2019-20) * Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students in district (60.6% in 2018-19; 57.3% in 2019-20; and 54.6% in 2020-21) * The number of English Language Learners in the district fluctuates from year to year: 52 ELL students in 2019-20 and 45 students in 2020-21) Academic Current State (using data from 2018-19 school year): • TCIS- According to KPREP data, TCIS is performing above the state average in all tested content areas. 8% increase in P/D (56.1) in On Demand writing with TCIS scoring 10% higher than state average, 33% increase in growth in math from 4th to 5th grade, 6% increase in P/D in Reading and Math for 5th grade students. • *TCMS - For the 2018-19 school year, TCMS's overall score increased by 10.1 points; The proficiency indicator for Math/Reading all grades increased by 5.1 points and is less than one point away from state average; TCMS growth (55.3) was above the state average (52.5); TCMS increased the overall proficient/distinguished rates in 4

content areas - Reading (+1.2), Math (+11.5), Science (+1.7), and Social St (+1.2); All grade levels increased math NAPD significantly - 6th grade (+ 16.7%), 7th grade (+15.4%), 8th grade (+3.0%). However, all content areas are below the state average.

- * TCHS - TCHS scored above the state average in Separate Academic Indicator (+4.4%), Transition Readiness (+4.9%), and Graduation Rate (7.9%). Our proficiency scores in math and reading were below the state averages and were labeled as low. On Demand scores decreased slightly from 2017-18 but our On Demand scores continue to be above the state average; Transition readiness scores (71.7%) increased 5.7% from the previous year and continue to be above state average but lower than many schools in the region. Graduation rate for 2018-19 was 99%.

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.

Priority: learning gaps - those that already existed as well as those that have been caused from the gaps in learning due to Covid-19 school closings. We are currently in the process of assessing these gaps. TCHS (College Readiness) The number of students hitting benchmarks on the ACT has decreased for reading and math. Only 38.7% met reading benchmark and only 32.2% met math benchmarks. For the class of 2019, 55% of students did NOT meet academic readiness standards as set by the state. TCMS (Science and On Demand Writing): Science proficiency scores (17.2) are significantly lower than state average (26.0); On Demand Writing Scores fell this year from 46% to 30.1% On Demand Writing Scores fell this year from 46% to 30.1% TCIS: Science proficiency scores were are state average (+.1) but still lag behind proficiency in other content areas

Trends

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

*Science proficiency rates at all grade levels continue to lag behind that of other content areas: Elementary (31.8%), Middle (17.2%), High (23.5%). At the middle and high school, proficiency levels are well below state average. *ACT - proficiency rates, composite scores, and subject level scores have decreased over the past two years.

*Reading proficiency rates at the middle (57.6%) and high school (38.7%) have continued to fall below state averages * On Demand writing proficiency rates have declined at the middle and high school over the past three years.

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](#)

1. (KCWP 1 and 2) Focus on collaboratively aligning curriculum in all areas to increase overall proficiency by vertically aligning in PLC's. 2. (KCWP 3): Create common unit assessments in all content areas that are aligned to the intent and rigor of the standards. Use MAP and ACT/KPrep data to calibrate the validity of common unit assessments 3. (KCWP 4) Implement and monitor districtwide system in PLC to review data to provide in class interventions to specific standards/targets 4. (KCWP 5): Continue to provide academic, behavior and emotional/social support for ALL students to grow. This will be monitored in weekly PLC's, MAP data three times a year and K-PREP/ACT data.





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%.

*Graduation rate continues to be very high as compared to the rest of the state (99% compared to state average of 91.2%) *District Attendance rates continue to hold strong for the district at 94.7%. *Growth increased at both the middle school and elementary school and above state growth average. * We saw increased proficiency rates in math in grades 5-8: 5th (+4.7%), 6th (+15.3%), 7th (+15.4%), 8th (+3.9%)

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 <p>2018-19 Taylor Co Data Release Slides for Public</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
 <p>2018-29 Taylor County Accountability Data Release with Next Steps</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
 <p>Taylor Co District PLC Protocols</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
 <p>TC Continuous Improvement Expectations</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •