

2018-19 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10182018_09:44

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Page School Center
William Lefevers
239 Page School Rd
Pineville, Kentucky, 40977-8775
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/26/2018
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment 3

Protocol 4

Current State 5

Priorities/Concerns 6

Trends 7

Potential Source of Problem..... 8

Strengths/Leverages 9

ATTACHMENT SUMMARY..... 10

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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 stakeholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

All members of the CSIP committee, Ann Stepp, Brooke Sanders, Amanda Elliott, Jason Stewart, Russell Greene, and Brian Williamson communicate monthly to review data received from other committees. All staff members review and analyze MAP and K-PREP data on work days (October 1 and 2, 2018) and in grade level component groups. The attendance committee- Chasity Brummett (lead), Rhonda Brown, Pam Miracle, Norma Saylor, and Ann Stepp meet monthly to analyze attendance data, set new goals, and plan interventions if needed for truant students. Mrs. Ann Stepp attends Math Leadership meetings with a district team of assistant principals led by Jennifer Yankey (Math Curriculum Coach). Mrs. Stepp brings information back to the math teachers and facilitates meetings as needed to discuss data analysis, provide observation feedback, and share information about strategies and goals made by the Math Leadership Team. All committees keep agendas and/or notes about their meetings as documentation.

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 gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among gap students in Reading from 2017 to 2018.
- 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 2017 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2016.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2018 from 276 in 2017.

Current Academic State: *The elementary reading proficiency index continues to increase annually with the exception of 5th grade, which had a slight decrease (3rd grade: 2015- 51.1, 2016- 65.4, and 2017- 68.6; 4th grade: 2015- 69.1, 2016- 73.95, and 2017- 78.1; 5th grade: 2015- 59.4, 2016- 82.9, and 2017- 79.2) *The elementary math proficiency index is inconsistent in growth within all grades. (3rd grade: 2015- 69.6, 2016- 52.5, and 2017- 52; 4th grade: 2015- 59.6, 2016- 73.95, and 2017- 68.8; 5th grade- 2015- 52.7, 2016- 81.3, and 2017- 76.9) * The middle grades reading proficiency scores are also inconsistent yearly, however students scoring proficient & distinguished have been trending slightly higher than the state average. (6th grade: 2015- 57.3, 2016- 76.4, and 2017- 73.3; 7th grade: 2015- 72.6, 2016- 62.4, and 2017- 87.5; 8th grade: 2015- 67.1, 2016- 78, and 72.5.) *The middle grades math proficiency scores have shown an increase overall for the past three consecutive years. (6th grade: 2015- 55.2, 2016- 63.2, and 2017- 70.1; 7th grade: 2015- 54.9, 2016- 61.4, and 2017- 68.4; 8th grade: 2015- 48.7, 2016- 53.1, and 2017- 64.1.) *Separate Academic Indicator scores show a decrease in Social Studies at both the 5th and 8th grade level. *On Demand Writing scores for 8th grade have increased from 2015-2017. *Science proficiency scores for 4th grade are 16.9 higher than the state index (76.6 compared to 58.7). 7th grade scores are slightly higher than the state index (56.6 compared to 53). *GAP data analysis shows that students with disabilities in 4th & 7th grade are performing much lower in reading and math when compared to all students. Sixth grade reading scores for students with disabilities are also significantly lower than all students. *There are no significant difference at any grade level or subject area for students identified as Free/Reduced lunch when compared to the all students index. Non- Academic Current State: *The student attendance rate was 92.8 in 2016-17 and 92.9 in 2017-18- a very small increase. For the current school year (2018-19), student attendance has increased for the first months of school. Staff attendance has been 98.95 and 97.80 for the first two months. *There were 10 total student suspensions in 2017-18. There are currently 11 suspensions for this school year 2018-19.

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

*69% of all students in the 3rd grade scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in math. *62.5% of all students in the 8th grade scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in math. (Gap learners- 65% were below proficiency in math) *Social Studies proficiency scores declined (5th grade 2016-17 93.8 to 71.8 in 2017-18 & 8th grade 201-17 99 to 78.1 in 2017-18). *79.4% of all students in the 7th grade scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in science. *Students with disabilities in 4th & 7th grade are performing substantially lower when compared to all students in both math and reading. (4th grade reading gap index is 59.4 and the all students index is 78. 4th grade math gap index is 53.1 and the all students index is 68. 7. 7th grade reading gap index is 62.5 and the all students index is 87.3. 7th grade math gap index is 37.5 and the all students index is 68.2.)

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?

*3rd grade math KPREP proficiency scores have declined each year (2015-16- 69.9, 2016-17- 52.5, and 2017-18- 52). *Middle grades students who are performing at the apprentice level on KPREP math have decreased, however it continues to be a trend that we will monitor for improvement (6th grade 2016-17- 38.2 and 2017-18- 20, 7th grade 2016-17- 45.5 and 2017-18- 20.6, & 8th grade 2016-17- 44.9 and 2017-18- 39.6). *27% of our students were chronically absent during the 2017-18 school year. As of October 2018, 16% of our students are chronically absent with 61% of those students being male.

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 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](#)

Our school will focus its resources and efforts upon design and deployment of standards. School and district leadership will monitor our math and reading programs through observations and data analysis to ensure the curriculum is taught at a high level of fidelity. A math leadership team is in place at the district level and pacing is being addressed as well as monitoring chapter assessment averages through math snapshots. Teachers received professional development during the summer for both the reading and math programs, and teachers continue to receive support from school administration, district curriculum coaches, and program specialists.

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%.

*100% of our first grade students benchmarked in math on the Fall 2018 MAP test. *70% of our 7th grade students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP reading. *Science proficiency scores for 4th grade are 16.9 higher than the state index (76.6 compared to 58.7). *On-Demand Writing scores for 8th grade have increased from 2015-2017. (2015- 62.1, 2016- 62.3, 2017- 69.1) *The middle grades math proficiency scores have shown an increase overall for the past three consecutive years. (6th grade: 2015- 55.2, 2016- 63.2, and 2017- 70.1; 7th grade: 2015- 54.9, 2016- 61.4, and 2017- 68.4; 8th grade: 2015- 48.7, 2016- 53.1, and 2017- 64.1.)

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)
-----------------	-------------	---------