Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic_10102017_14:46

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic

Bell County
Yvonne Gilliam
211 Virginia Ave
Pineville, Kentucky, 40977
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2017
Last Modified: 11/01/2017
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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?

Data is analyzed at the individual school level and at the district level. Both the district and school level analysis includes reviewing elementary to middle to high school as well as each content area. The analysis is then narrowed down by grade levels such as elementary reading would be broken into 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade reading scores. This is completed for both reading and math at elementary and middle levels. The results of this analysis is used at all levels to create teacher level goals and action plans addressing needs of individual students or gaps in instruction. The teacher goals are then used by the school leadership to determine if the school goals will be met if teacher goals are met. If so, then the teacher action plans are used by school leadership to create a school plan that addresses activities to be implemented, expected impact, how progress will be measured, and how progress will be monitored. These school level plans are used to inform the district plan. District personnel are used as resources to help the schools with their analysis and their action plans. The district leadership team for the District Improvement Plan includes a representative from each school building, Director of Pupil Personnel, Director of Special Education, both Instructional Supervisors, the Community Education Coordinator, and the Title I Director. The planning team meets in stages that goes along with the various phases of the continuous improvement process. The team has presently met once in September, once in October, a portion of the team will be attending the eProve training together, and a portion will also attend the Equity Lab in November along with other in district meetings in order to complete the improvement plan and then for monitoring purposes as well. Each of the meetings have a sign in sheet, an agenda, and materials that were used for the meeting. There are also informal meetings held throughout this time working with individual members of the planning team regarding specific data, specific goals, strategies, and activities.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

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: -All content areas in elementary, middle and high school either maintained or improved in their achievement score for the 2016-2017 school year. -Math is the lowest scoring achievement area at both elementary with 64.9 and middle grades with 64.7. -The high school district average for ACT is 18.9 which is below the state average of 19.8. Non-Academic Current State: - District wide attendance has been an issue over the past 3 years: 2014-2015 attendance 92.01% (state 94.5%), 2015-2016 attendance 91.72% (state 94.5%), and 2016-2017 attendance of 93.26% (state 94.4%). All three years are well below the state average.

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.

-Elementary Math: Lowest Achievement score with a 64.9; 4th Grade Math with 55.3% of students in non-duplicated gap group scoring below proficiency on KPREP test as opposed to 46% of non-gap learners. - Elementary Reading: Trend data for the past 6 years shows an inconsistent pattern of increasing and decreasing over the course of that time 2012 - 61, 2013 - 60.5; 2014 - 67.7; 2015 - 66.3; 2016 - 66.4; 2017 - 68.5.

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?

- Over the past 3 years, elementary reading has been flat lined for two years (2014-2015 66.3 and 2015-2016 66.4) with a slight increase during the 2016-2017 of 68.5. -Over the past 3 years, elementary math has shown some growth from 52.5 in 2014-2015 to 64.4 in 2015-2016 to current score of 64.9 in 2016-17, but this is still the lowest scoring elementary achievement area for the district. -Middle grades writing has shown a flat line from 2015-2016 of 75.2 to 75.1 in 2016-2017. -The ACT score at the high school level has shown little to no growth from 2012-2016 with the scores being 18.4 or 18.3. During the 2016-2017 year there was an increase of 18.9.

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 district will focus resources and efforts in the Key Core Work Processes in Areas of #2 - Delivery of Instruction, #3 - Assessment Literacy, and #4 - Review, Analyze, and Apply Data Results in the content areas of reading and math at the elementary levels. These same areas will be utilized to target increased achievement at the high school level for the ACT overall composite score. Our district's elementary reading program is Success for All (SFA). We have had this program for at least 18 years. As with any program that is being implemented over time, an evaluation of the fidelity of implementation and evaluation of curriculum alignment to check for gaps in instruction must occur in order to ensure that reading is being taught at a rigorous level. Our district's elementary math program is Math In Focus (Singapore Math). This program was implemented district wide 3 years ago. At that time, data trends showed gains in the math. However, math is still one of the lowest performing in achievement. The same evaluation of this program must occur to determine quality of instruction, rigor, assessment driven lesson planning, and any gaps in instruction.

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%.

-Elementary Achievement increased from 70.3 to 73.5. All content areas at the elementary level increased: reading 66.4 to 68.5, math 64.4 to 64.9, social studies 78 to 81.7, writing 70.1 to 78.2, and language 81.6 to 83.9. -Elementary Gap increased by 18.4 points from 50.0 to 68.4. -Middle Achievement increased from 72.2 to 76.6. All content areas except writing increased: reading 70.5 to 79.7, math 61.0 to 64.7, social studies 84.9 to 86, language 62.5 to 79.9. -High School Achievement has increased from 61.4 to 67.7. All content areas have increased: reading 5.5 to 65.6, math 56.2 to 62.1, science, 56.4 to 62.1, social studies 61.7 to 68, and writing from 74 to 83.8.

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)

eProve diagnostics