



2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for  
Districts\_08302021\_15:00

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

**Caverna Independent**  
**Cornelius Faulkner**  
1102 N Dixie Hwy  
Cave City, Kentucky, 42127  
United States of America

---

## Table of Contents

2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts Understanding Continuous I...	3
Attachment Summary	9

## **2021-22 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment for Districts**

The Needs Assessment Diagnostic will facilitate the use of multiple sources of data to determine the current reality and establish a foundation for decision-making around district goals and strategies. Once completed, the diagnostic will lead to priorities to be addressed in the comprehensive district improvement plan to build staff capacity and increase student achievement. The needs assessment 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).

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes).

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 to 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**

1. Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results to determine the priorities of this year's needs assessment. Include names of district leadership teams and stakeholder groups involved, a timeline of the process, the specific data reviewed, and how the meetings are documented.

Caverna Independent Schools utilizes a district established data review process to analyze school and district level academic and nonacademic data which includes stakeholder perception survey data. This process includes charting and graphing data, determining key observations from the data, and developing hypotheses of practice. Different levels of leadership teams made up of various stakeholders follow this analysis process. We have established a district level Strategic Growth and Improvement Committee which is made of a variety of internal and external partners. This committee analyzes/evaluates federal programs and provides the

opportunity for stakeholder input on key district decisions. This committee meets quarterly. The district leadership team meets monthly and consists of district and school leadership, family resource and youth service center director, technology, and finance. Each school has an established Site based decision making council which consists of teachers and parents. The DLT analyzes data, reviews programs, and provides critical information across all leadership in the district. At Caverna High School, the council has established four committees: Academic, Cultural, Safety, and PBIS. All certified staff have been assigned to serve on one of the four committees. These teams begin with large school level data and drill down to specific student needs. The committees will meet each month with a specific agenda. Furthermore, all certified staff spend time during faculty meetings analyzing assessment results and breaking down various aspects of the state provided data. Agendas for faculty meetings and committee meetings can be found on the school blog spot. During data review meetings, teachers follow our district established data review retreat which includes all teachers that review, analyze and apply school-wide data results. We have PLCs teams that are team based and content based that meet weekly and follow an established data team process. The SBDM meets monthly and is made up of three teachers, two parents, and one administrator. Caverna Middle School has established content level data teams which review, analyze, and apply data results. Data teams look at sets of data from universal screeners and KPREP data, as well as formative assessment classroom data on a weekly basis. CMS has also established a school improvement committee and culture committee to review data. Meetings are documented with agendas and data posters that are visible in the school data room. Caverna Elementary School utilizes contract days and faculty meetings to review and analyze data as an entire staff. They follow the district established data review process to develop hypotheses of practice and evaluate programs to establish goals and strategies. Each school's SBDM meets monthly, whole faculties meet monthly, small committees meet monthly, and data team PLCs meet weekly. The district leadership team meets monthly. All meetings are documented with agendas and minutes.

## Trends

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

### **Example of Trends**

- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2019-20 to 288 in 2020-21.
- From 2018 to 2020, the district saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.

---

Overall, our district saw a slight improvement in our ACT scores and in writing across the district. We saw a drastic increase in novice at our elementary school and in math at the middle school. Our behavior referrals decreased most likely due to Covid and so many students on virtual or quarantined.

### Current State

3. Plainly state the current condition of the district using precise numbers and percentages as revealed by multiple sources of outcome data. 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.
- 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 rate was 84% for the 2020-21 academic year
- Survey results and perception data indicated 74% of the district's teachers received adequate professional development.

CHS: Overall composite ACT scores INCREASED from 14.7 in 2020 to 15.7 in 2021. English increased from 13.6 to 14.4, Reading INCREASED from 14.3 to 15.7 and Science increased from 14.9 to 16.5. On KPREP, 67.5% of all students scored below proficiency in Reading 76.8% of all students scored below proficiency in Math, 78.3% of all students scored below proficiency in Science, 63.8% scored P/D in writing.

CMS: 91% of students scored Novice or Apprentice in Math on the KPREP test administered in the Spring of 2021. 8.5% of students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Math on the KPREP test administered in the spring. 65.4% of CMS students scored Novice or Apprentice in Reading on the KPREP test administered in the spring of 2021. 34.7% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading on the KPREP test administered in the spring of 2021. 65% of CMS students scored Novice or Apprentice on the On Demand portion of the KPREP test in the spring of 2021. 35% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished in the On Demand portion of the KPREP in the spring of 2021. 85% of CMS students scored Novice or Apprentice on the Science portion of the KPREP test administered in the spring of 2021. 15% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished on the Science portion of the KPREP test administered in the Spring of 2021. CES: - 55% of students scored novice in math compared to the state average of of 30% on most recent KPREP. - 14% of students scored proficient/distinguished in reading

compared to the state average of 20% on most recent KPREP. - 4% of students scored proficient/distinguished in writing compared to the state average of 40% on most recent KPREP. - Based on Reading MAP scores (fall 2021) the number of novice students stands at 43%, which seems to show a positive trend compared to most recent KPREP scores of 62% novice. - Based on Math MAP scores (fall 2021) there is an 11% decrease in novice students compared to the most recent KPREP scores.

### Priorities/Concerns

4. Clearly and concisely identify the greatest 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.

Our main priority across the district is the number of students scoring Novice at the elementary and our math scores across the district. CHS: 67.5% of all students scored below proficiency in Reading, 76.8% of all students scored below proficiency in Math, 78.3% of all students scored below proficiency in Science, ACT scores: 7.8% of all students made CPE benchmark in Math 17.6 of all students made CPE benchmark in Reading 19.6 of all students made CPE benchmark in English CMS: KPREP 91% of students scored Novice or Apprentice in Math on the KPREP test administered in the Spring of 2021. 8.5% of students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Math on the KPREP test administered in the spring. 65.4% of CMS students scored Novice or Apprentice in Reading on the KPREP test administered in the spring of 2021. 34.7% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading on the KPREP test administered in the spring of 2021. 65% of CMS students scored Novice or Apprentice on the On Demand portion of the KPREP test in the spring of 2021. 35% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished in the On Demand portion of the KPREP in the spring of 2021. 85% of CMS students scored Novice or Apprentice on the Science portion of the KPREP test administered in the spring of 2021. 15% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished on the Science portion of the KPREP test administered in the Spring of 2021 CES: 62% of students are novice in reading (KPREP 2021) compared to 35% for the state average. Another area of weakness that ties into reading, is 48% of students novice in writing compared to 16% for the state.

### Strengths/Leverages

---

5. Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the district. Explain how they may be utilized to improve areas of concern listed above.

**Example:** Reading achievement has increased from 37% proficient to its current rate of 58%. The systems of support we implemented for reading can be adapted to address our low performance in math.

CHS: 63.8% of all students scored proficient or distinguished in Writing on KREP The four year graduation rate has held consistent at around 90% and above the state cut off average. The attendance rate has held consistent at around 92% and above the state average. 68% of all students did not have a behavior event in 2018-19; 71% of all students did not have a behavior event in 2019-20 91% of all students did not have a behavior incident in 2020-21 CMS: 34.7% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading on the KPREP test administered in the spring of 2021. 35% of CMS students scored Proficient or Distinguished in the On Demand portion of the KPREP in the spring of 2021. CES: Based on Reading MAP scores (fall 2021) the number of novice students stands at 43%, which is a 19% decrease compared to 62% novice on 2021 KPREP. Being back in person and utilizing reading interventionists and leveled supports for early primary with the use of Heggerty, we feel we are addressing our areas of low performance in reading.

### Evaluate the Teaching and Learning Environment

6. Consider the processes, practices and conditions evident in the teaching and learning environment as identified in 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](#)

Utilizing implementation data, perception data, and current policies and practices:

a. Complete the [Key Elements Template](#).

b. Upload your completed template in the attachment area below.

After analyzing the Key Elements of your teaching and learning environment, which processes, practices or conditions will the district 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.

**NOTE:** These elements will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) diagnostic and template.

Key elements template attached...

## **ATTACHMENTS**

### **Attachment Name**

---



CES evidence 2021-22



CHS needs assessment evidence



CMS needs assessment evidence



District Behavior Data



District evidence 2021-22



District Key Elements 2021-22

# Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 CES evidence 2021-22	CES evidence 2021-22	• 6
 CHS needs assessment evidence		• 6
 CMS needs assessment evidence		• 6
 District Behavior Data		• 6
 District evidence 2021-22	District evidence 2021-22	• 6
 District Key Elements 2021-22	District Key Elements	• 6