

2018-19 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10172018_15:51

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Fleming Neon Middle School

Ronny Goins

Neon, 41840

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 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 is a constant process at Fleming-Neon Middle School. Our PLC teams (composed of teachers who teach the same content area) meet weekly to analyze formative and summative data, including benchmark assessments such as MAP when available. Our Administration team, consisting of the principal, guidance counselor, gear up academic specialist, district contact, family resource coordinator, and a classroom teacher meets every 2 weeks and analyze data from various sources such as; attendance, MAP diagnostic, TELL survey, Parent surveys, etc. Our SBDM meets monthly and also looks at these sources of data. Our KPREP data is analyzed by all of these committees as well. We actually have a professional development day in which the main priority is analyzing data in depth from the previous years KPREP scores once the data becomes available and detailing next steps.

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.
- Our percentage of students scoring proficient/distinguished were higher than the district and state average in the following subjects; Reading (School-67.3%, District-65.2%, State-60%), Math (School-56.8%, District-51.2%, State-47%), Science (School-26.7%, District-23.7%, State-25.9%), Social Studies (School-77.1%, District -65.5%, State-60.4%) -We had a very low percentage of students scoring novice in the following areas; Math (4.5%), Science (3.3%), Social Studies (2.9%) and Writing (5.7%) -Our students with disabilities scored significantly lower than the total student population in several categories on KPREP; Reading (disability group) 51% Proficient/Distinguished compared to 67.3% Proficient/Distinguished (total population), Math (disability group) 30.6% Proficient/Distinguished compared to 56.8% P/D (total population), Science (disability group) 6.3% P/D compared to 26.7% (total population), Social Studies (disability) 56.3% P/D compared to 77.1% P/D (total population), and Writing (disability) 31.3% P/D compared to 45.7% P/D (total population) -We saw a significant difference in the percentage of boys scoring P/D compared to the girls in the following areas; Reading (B-62.9%, G-73.5%), Science (B-31.6%, G-18.2%), Social Studies (B-84.6%, G-67.7%). Writing (B-28.2%, G-67.7%) -14.6% of our students scored Novice in Reading -70% of our students scored Apprentice in Science -On our latest MAP assessment (Fall) we had 37.1% of our 6th graders score Novice in Reading, however our 7th graders scored 53% P/D and had an NAPD of 71.6.

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.

-Our students with disabilities scored significantly lower than the total student population in several categories on KPREP; Reading (disability group) 51% Proficient/Distinguished compared to 67.3% Proficient/Distinguished (total population), Math (disability group) 30.6% Proficient/Distinguished compared to 56.8% P/D (total population), Science (disability group) 6.3% P/D compared to 26.7% (total population), Social Studies (disability) 56.3% P/D compared to 77.1% P/D (total population), and Writing (disability) 31.3% P/D compared to 45.7% P/D (total population) -We saw a significant difference in the percentage of boys scoring P/D compared to the girls in the following areas; Reading (B-62.9%, G-73.5%), Science (B-31.6%, G-18.2%), Social Studies (B-84.6%, G-67.7%). Writing (B-28.2%, G-67.7%) -14.6% of our students scored Novice in Reading -70% of our students scored Apprentice in Science

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?

-Our attendance has been well below the state average as well as our district goal -We need to continue to try to close the achievement gap between our students with disabilities and our total student population

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](#)

-Principal will ensure teachers design lessons with students' cultural, social, and developmental needs in mind. -Principal will ensure teachers utilize formative and summative information to increase student achievement.

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%.

-Our percentage of students scoring proficient/distinguished were higher than the district and state average in the following subjects; Reading (School-67.3%, District-65.2%, State-60%), Math (School-56.8%, District-51.2%, State-47%), Science (School-26.7%, District-23.7%, State-25.9%), Social Studies (School-77.1%, District -65.5%, State-60.4%) -We had a very low percentage of students scoring novice in the following areas; Math (4.5%), Science (3.3%), Social Studies (2.9%) and Writing (5.7%)

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