

18-19 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_11132018_13:41

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Hillard Collins Elementary School

Thomas Wayne Loring
9000 Spruce Dr
Florence, Kentucky, 41042
United States of America

Last Modified: 12/18/2018

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?

Data analysis begins at the building level with all administrative team members reviewing data as it comes to us from K-PREP. We analyze data provided to determine content areas and gap groups we need to improve. When permitted, share the data with all faculty for an overall snapshot. Grade levels then receive their data on last year's students and they dis aggregate the data to look for trends of success and areas of weakness. All SBDM members are provided detailed scores from K-PREP. SBDM members are also informed of formative assessment through the use of STAR, to review growth in the areas of reading and math. These assessments are given 3 times a year. Both reviews are documented through the SBDM meeting minutes. At the building level for formative assessments throughout the school year we also review student data with all grade levels teachers every 6-8 weeks though the Advisory Team process used with the Response to Intervention protocol set up. Based on this work the level of intervention for students scoring in the bottom 20th percentile are tracked and monitored for growth. These meetings are documented by keeping a continuous running document of each of the students entered in to RTI. Review of benchmark scores are also taking place at grade level meetings and students are tracked using a data wall.

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.

Overall Proficiency: Proficiency percentage was 47.6 for the 2018 school year. This is a baseline year so data does not correlate with the previous year's data. Separate Academic indicator for our building was 42.3. The overall growth score for our building was 17.5. Growth score for reading: 21.5, Math: 13.5. The % P/D dropped from 34.4 to 32.4 in Reading, increased from 23.4 to 26.2 in math. Overall Gap: Gap was 25.1 for for the 2017 school year - an increase from 20.5 in 2016. Overall Growth: Growth was 44.1 for the 2017 school year - a decrease from 47.2 in 2016. TELL Survey: Q5.1b: Students at this school follow rules of conduct. Percentage was 26.3% for the 2017 school year - a decrease from 61.7% in 2016.

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.

48.8% of students in the gap areas of F/R Lunch, Disability, African American, Hispanic, and 2 or more Races scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to 39.1% with all students. - Novice Reduction or Gap 70.7% of all students scored below proficiency in combined reading and math as opposed to 29.3% scoring proficient or distinguished.

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?

To continue the work on reducing the novice percentages for all students. Continue to work reducing the Gap within all subgroups. priority focus on the African American population, which gives us the TSI label.

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](#)

KCWP 2: Design and Delivery 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%.

Overall math scores for % proficient and Distinguished had an increase of 2.6%.

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)
 17-18 K-PREP Testing Graphs	17-18 K-PREP Testing Graphs	
 Continuous Improvement Planning Cycle	Continuous Improvement Planning Cycle	