

## 2018-2019 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts\_10312018\_14:47

### Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

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

Target Completion Date: 12/01/2018  
Last Modified: 11/01/2018  
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 Districts

### 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?

Data is analyzed at both the school and district levels. The analysis at both levels includes reviewing elementary, middle, and high school as well as each individual content area at all levels. The analysis is then narrowed down by grade levels. For example, elementary reading would be drilled down to third, fourth and fifth grade reading scores. This is completed for both reading and math at elementary and middle grades. The results of this analysis is used at all levels to create teacher level goals and action plans addressing the 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 addressing activities to be implemented, expected impact, as well as how progress will be measured and monitored. These school level plans re 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, Instructional Supervisors, the Community Education Coordinator, and the Title I Director. The planning team meets in stages the correlate with the various phases of the continuous improvement process. The team has presently met once in September to review Phase I and Phase II with another meeting to be held early in November. Documentation of all meetings will be kept including sign in sheets, agendas, resource materials, and meeting notes. There are also informal meetings held throughout the process working with individual members of the planning team regarding specific data, goals, strategies, and activities.

### **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: All schools at all levels (elementary, middle, and high) are categorized as Other. - District middle level reading (82.2) and math (70.1) are both higher than the state (Reading - 75.8; Math - 69.7) which make up the proficiency indicator. Both district elementary and district high schools levels are below the state in reading and math (Reading District Elem 70.9; State Elem 71.9; Math District Elem 64.3; State Elem 69.1; District High School Reading 61.2 and State HS Read 62.1; District HS Math 50.8 and State HS Math 56.5). -Separate Academic Indicator: Elementary (60.9) and Middle(57.6) level science scores are above state average (E - 58.7; M - 53.0). Elementary (79.1) and Middle (76.3) level writing are both higher than state average (E - 63.0; M - 67.7). Social studies is above the state average at the middle level (district 81.5; state 79.8). At the high school level the district average for the ACT is 18.7 which was a drop from the previous year Non Academic Current State: District attendance continues to be an issue with the average district attendance being below state average for the past four years. 2014-2015 district attendance of 92.01% (state 94.5%); 2015-2016 attendance of 91.72% (state 94.5%); 2016-2017 attendance of 92.26% (state 94.4%); 2017-2018 92.56% (state 94.5%).

## 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.

Elementary Reading and Math are both below state average and are priority concerns. Elementary Reading District score 70.9 (state 71.9); Elementary Math District score 64.3 (state 69.1). Although the current data cannot be compared to the previous years' scores, both of these areas were the priority concern for the 2017-2018 school year.

### **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?

Elementary reading and math are below the state average for the previous two years -Reading 2016-2017 score of 68.5 to 2017-2018 score of 70.9; Math 2016-2017 64.9 to 2017-2018 64.3. The ACT score at the high school level has declined from the 16-17 year of 18.9 to current year's score of 18.7.

### **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](#)

The district will focus resources and efforts in the Key Core Work Processes areas of Delivery of Instruction, Assessment Literacy, and Review, Analyze and Apply Data results in the content areas of elementary reading and math. These same areas will be utilized to target increased achievement at the high school for the ACT overall composite score with an emphasis on math and reading. Our district's elementary reading program is Success for All (SFA). We have had this program for a minimum of 19 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 rigorous levels. Our district's elementary math program is Math In Focus. This program was implemented district wide 4 years ago. The same evaluation must occur with this program in order to determine quality of instruction, rigor, assessment driven lesson planning and gaps in curriculum and 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%.

The middle school level (grades 6 - 8) are a strength in the district. The middle school as a whole is above the state average in every content area assessed at the middle grades level (reading 82.2, math 70.1, science 57.6, social studies 81.5, writing 76.3). The middle grades area has had the least amount of change in teachers and the content that they are teaching.

### **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)
-----------------	-------------	---------