



East Oldham MS 2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for  
Schools\_10212020\_09:17

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

**East Oldham Middle School**  
**Mark Robson**  
1201 East Hwy 22  
Crestwood, Kentucky, 40014  
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
Attachment Summary	11

## **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?

When the data is released, EOMS begins the process of analyzing data. Specific attention is applied to students with disabilities and students receiving interventions within Tier 3 and Targeted Tier 2 groups. Our leadership team (principals, coaches and lead teachers) did into the data to check the progress of our programs aimed at meeting the needs of students who struggle. The principal reports to the faculty first, when permissible, and then to the SBDM and other parent groups. Spreadsheets are kept that are shared with all teaching staff. Our teams meet weekly or monthly to review progress.

## 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.

Note: The last available KPREP data is from the 2018/19 school year. Academic State. Proficiency -- Reading - 74.6% (state - 59.6%) , Math - 70.8% (state - 46.4%) , Social Studies - 73.4 (state - 58.8%) , Science - 41% (state - 26%) , Writing - 42.6 (state - 31.9%) . Novice - Reading - 8.7% (state - 19.5%) , Math - 5% (state - 14.6%) , Social Studies - 4.5% (state - 10.2%) , Science - 13.1% (state - 20.6%) , Writing - 9%,(state - 20.4%).

## 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.

Gap Groups - gaps in proficiency 67% of students with disabilities scored below proficiency in reading on the KPREP test. 75% of students with disabilities scored below proficiency in math on the KPREP test.

## Trends

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

READING - 2018/19 scores were a slight decrease from 17/18. The overall 3 year trend is increasing. ECS - the 3 year year trend indicates an increase in P/D. Poverty - the 3 year trend is a slight increase in P/D. MATH - 2018/19 scores were a slight decrease from 17/18. The 3 year trend is a slight increase in P/D. ECS - the 3 year year trend indicates an increase in P/D. Poverty - the 3 year year trend indicates an decrease in P/D.



## 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](#)

With high proficiency scores, our data indicates we have room to grow. Tier 1 instruction (KCWP 2) , along with targeted instruction (KCWP 4, 5) can help us reach the students who are non-proficient.


## 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%.

We have seen significant growth in our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Our focused work, targeting our students in the Novice and apprentice band resulted in higher growth numbers for students in ECS, or poverty as compared to their peers.

# Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 <u>EOMS Data Book</u>		.