

Hazard Independent Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic 2017

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic

Hazard Independent
705 Main St
Hazard, Kentucky, 41701
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/30/2017
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	7

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

Rationale: 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 (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 (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/district 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. **As required by Section 1008 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools must base their program upon a thorough needs assessment.**

Protocol

Clearly detail the process used for reviewing, analyzing and applying data results. Include names of school/district councils, leadership teams and shareholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

Needs assessment provides the framework for our improvement plan. The school councils, leadership teams and shareholder groups meet, review, and analyze all the data results. After the extensive review of all the sources of data, the district board of education holds a review at each school to explain our current state and present our desired state. At this review, the SBDM council presents their analysis of the most critical areas for improvement and the celebration of goals that were achieved. Once goals, objectives, strategies and activities are established, the PLC's, SBDM and parent/community stakeholder groups are updated with progress at various times throughout the year. The CSIP's and CDIP are presented and approved by the board of education. Using progress monitoring, CSIP's and CDIP are updated throughout the year, as needed. Sign-in sheets or agendas are kept at these reviews. See attached Chart:

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

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:

- 32% of non-duplicated gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2015 to 2016.
- 34%% of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 47%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 87% for the 2016 schools year – a decrease from 92% in 2015.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2017 from 276 in 2016.

Current Academic State: *Our KPREP combined reading/math percent Proficient & Distinguished (P/D) is as follows: Roy G Elementary (RGE) students scored 67.4%, Hazard Middle(HMS)

students scored 62.4%, Hazard High Schools(HHS) students scored 65.8%. *KPREP reading percent P/D is as follows: Elementary students scored 74.2%; HMS students scored 63.9%; HHS students 71.1(KPREP EOC). *KPREP math percent P/D: Elementary students scored 60.6%; HMS students scored 60.8%; HHS 60.5%. * We saw a 13.5% increase in points in combined reading and math score at the elementary level where they met their delivery target; HHS and HMS did not meet the delivery target in combined reading and math. HMS missed the target by 5.8% and HHS missed the target by 4.3% . *We saw a decrease of students scoring novice from 2015-16 at - RGE- 21.8% to 2016-17 12.6%; -HMS from 2015-16 14.4% to 2016-17 to 11.5%. *Math P/D- RGE scored 11.5% higher than state, HHS scored 22.4% higher, HMS scored 13.8% higher. *Reading P/D- RGE scored 19.9% higher than state, HMS scored 7% higher, HHS scored 15.3% higher. *70.7% of students are identified as College and career ready whereas the state percentage was 65.1. The delivery target was 77.3, therefore HHS did not meet target. *The ACT combined score average was 19.3. *Preschool students scored 65.7% ready for kindergarten. Non-Academic Current state: Professional Development: TELL Survey Results-45% of teachers need professional learning in differentiating instruction and teaching students with disabilities to teach your students more effectively; 52% need PD in closing the achievement gap; 47% need PD in integrating technology in the classroom. Student attendance rate: SAAR report indicates that district attendance is 93.8 meeting the target of 92.8*

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using **precise numbers and percentages** as revealed by the analysis of academic and non-academic data points.

Example: 68% of students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

ACADEMIC: * 67.4% of elementary students in non-duplicated gap scored P/D on KPREP test in reading and math as opposed to 42.8% non -gap learners. *15% of middle school students with disabilities scored P/D in reading as compared to 26% state-wide. 12% of middle school students with disabilities scored P/D in math as compared to 26% state-wide. *48.4% of middle school students in non-duplicated scored P/D in math as opposed to state 35.9%. *62.4% of middle school students scored P/D in combined reading and math indicating that we did not meet our annual goal of 68.2%. *63.9% of middle school students scored P/D in reading indicating that we did not meet our annual target of 71.6%. *60.5% of middle school students score P/D on math indicating that we did not meet our goal of 62.8%. *65.8% of high school students scored P/D on combined reading and math indicating that we did not meet our annual delivery target of 70.1%. *71.1% of high school students scored P/D on reading indicating that we did not meet our annual target of 77.5%. *60.5% of high school students scored P/D on math indicating that we did not meet our annual target of 62.8%. NON-ACADEMIC: ATTENDANCE: Federal data on school report card indicates the following for attendance: 93.5% attendance rate for high school students, 94.3% attendance rate for middle school, 93.6% attendance rate for elementary. 93.6% attendance rate for elementary students indicating we did not meet our target of 94%. 93.8% attendance rate for the district as opposed to the state 94.5%. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Teachers indicated on TELL survey the following areas that there is a need for professional learning to teach more effectively: Differentiating Instruction- 45%, Special Ed (teaching students with disabilities)- 45%, closing the achievement gap-52%, Integrating technology into classroom- 36%.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Trends

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

After analyzing data trends, students scores reveal that for combined reading and math at the high school level the annual delivery target has not been met since 2014-2015. Scores for reading reveal that the delivery target has not been met at high school level since 2014 even though the scores have steadily improved over the past three years. The middle school students reading scores reveal that the delivery target has not been met in past two years for reading. All three schools in math have not met delivery target two out of the past three years. The students with disabilities at the high school and middle school level have not met the delivery target in past three years for combined reading and math, reading only and math only indicating a significant area for improvement. After analyzing safety data in school report card and Tell survey there are no significant areas of concern. The TELL survey results reveal that 80.3% of teachers feel that the school are clean and well maintained which we contribute to the schools renovations but will continue to address.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

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 school improvement strategies outlined below:

[1- Deployment of Standards](#)

[2- Delivery of Instruction](#)

[3- Assessment Literacy](#)

[4- Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results](#)

[5- Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus](#)

[6- Establish a Learning Culture and Environment](#)

The school district plans to focus its resources on delivery of instruction and design, align and deliver support processes with sub groups in order to produce the desired changes. Quarterly reports will ensure that monitoring of design and delivery of instruction. Guiding questions for quality practice will be the following: How does the teacher monitor the learning before, during and after instruction? and What process is utilized by classroom teachers when measuring instructional effectiveness based on student data. The district will monitor using the quarterly reports and walk through to ensure that instructional program is intentional and of the highest quality. Tier 1 is highly effective, culturally responsive, evidence based core instruction provided to all students in the classroom. Teachers must implement evidence based curriculum and strategies fidelity for both academic and behavioral instruction. The quarterly reports also will monitor the design, align, deliver support processes. The guiding questions for quality practice will be the following: What processes do teachers currently have in place that ensure behavioral interventions are taking place and monitored to meet the needs of all students? and What system or processes are in place to ensure appropriate academic interventions are taking place to meet the needs of students? The district will use the quarterly monitoring tool to monitor and evaluate effectiveness in order to improve problems and improve systems. Continuous improvement will use data to improve work processes to support student learning. The alignment of the plan will include the use of resources to support best practice strategies. Resources will be aligned to needs in order to make all systems work together for improvement and success.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data.

Example: Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

-RGE met all delivery targets: *Combined reading and math score of 67.4% is 6% higher than the target of 61.4%. This has been a steady improvement from 52.1% in 2014-2015 to 67.4% in 2016-2017 *Reading score 74.2% is 9.6% higher than the target of 64.6%. Continuing improvement in reading from 57.9% in 2014-2015 to 74.2% in 2016-2017. *math score of 60.6% is 2.2% higher than the target of 58.4%. The RGE students have steadily improved scores from 46.2% in 2014-2015 to 60.6% in 2016-2017. -HMS * The reading score has steadily improved from 51.9% in 2014-2015 to 60.8% in 2016-2017 * The math score has increased from 60.2% in 2014-2015 to 60.8% in 2016-2017. -HHS *The reading score has increased from 60.2% in 2014-2015 to 71.1% in 2016-2017. * The math score has increased from 59.7% in 2014-2015 to 60.5% in 2016-2017. * The combined reading and math has increased from 59.7% in 2014-2015 to 65.8% in 2016-2017. * Graduation rate has increased from 95.7 to 96.4. -STATE FUNDED PRESCHOOL Increased kindergarten readiness on the Brigance from 42.9% ready in 2014-2015 to 65.5% ready in 2016-2017.

ATTACHMENTS

Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY

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