

2018-2019 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10182018_10:22

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Arlie Boggs Elementary School
Freddie Terry
Eolia, 40826

Last Modified: 12/16/2018
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 diagnostic and desaggregation is an integral part of our improvement process. While we as a staff celebrate successes we quickly identify areas of need and make changes to meet attainable goals. Once KPREP data is released we begin the process of digging deep. A bulk of the work is completed on a district wide data day in October (15th). Certified staff use the KDE provided workbook to explore data and answer critical questions. Beyond that day we utilize PLC's to name and claim our students. We identify those that were novice and commit to meeting their needs to bring them out of that category. We also begin the process of identifying those individuals whose score lie within 10 points of the cut score for each category. WE make a plan to push those below that cut line to increase a level and to reinforce academic needs to ensure those on the upper end of the line don't slip and fall a category. Data days, parent conferences, and "real talk" with stakeholders is key to our success. Listed below are groups and individuals that play a role in our data analysis. SBDM council parent members - Ernie Scott and Stella Morris. Teachers - Tommy Boggs, Myrtle Boggs, Mackensie Kvalvik, Colter Sumpter, Suzette Sturgill, Patricia Bentley, Sarah Bailey, Kyra Hendrickson, Deb Hall, Robert Scheeler. District - Brian Johnson, Jackie Collins, Denise Yonts. School Guidance Counselor - Karen Caudill

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.

Elementary: -Above the state average in Reading 64.9% (54.6%) and Math 59.5% (48.8%) -Below the state average in Science 30% (30.9%), Social Studies 47.1% (53%), and Writing 11.8% (40.5%) Middle: -Above the state average in Reading 75% (60%) and Science 46.7% (25.9%) - Below the state average in Math 39.6% (47%), Social Studies 42.9% (60.4%), and Writing 42.9% (44.4%) Non-Academic: -TELL Survey Q2.1c concerning classroom interruptions increased to 92.9% from 85.7% -Overall TELL rating for being a good place to work decreased 92.9% (100%) - The five year average for behavior resolutions is 5.4 per year. 2017-2018 had 9 which is higher than our annual average. -Attendance rate decreased slightly from 93.5%(16-7) to 93.14%(17-18)

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: -Science, Social Studies, and Writing as stated above are below the state and district averages. -Writing with the greatest discrepancy below district (-32) and state (28.7) -Growth is below the cut score 15.4 (15.8) Middle: -Math, Social Studies, and Writing as stated above are below the state and district averages. -Social Studies has the greatest discrepancy from district (-22.6) and state (- 17.5)

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?

Elementary decreases: current (2016-17) (2015-2016) -Reading 64.9 (67.4) (70) decrease of 5.1%
-Math 59.5 (55.8) (64) decrease of 4.5% -Social Studies 47.1 (52.9) (81.8) decrease of 34.7% -
Writing 11.8 (41.2) (27.3) decrease of 15.5% Middle School decreases: current (2016-17)
(2015-16) -Math 39.6 (46.3) (43.2) decrease of 3.6% -Social Studies 42.9 (57.1) (63.6) decrease of
20.7% -Writing 42.9 (50) (52) decrease of 9.1% Middle school reading is the only subject area that
has seen an overall increase in the past two years.

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](#)

Developing an uniform way to review, analyze, and apply data results (4) and deliver those processes with our improvement in mind (5). We have implemented a monthly data day in our PLC protocol. This day is an opportunity for teachers to address issues in our proficiency performance also analyzing our GAP population data to ensure that we are moving in the right direction.

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%.

Middle school reading proves to be our greatest area for continuous improvement. Currently 75% P/D showing steady increase. 2016-17 63.4% and 2015-2016 73%. Science in the middle school (46.7) is exceeding state (25.9) and district (23.7) averages as well. Our free and reduced population is exceeding the cut scores in SAI (63.7). Middle school growth (14.2) also exceeds the cut score (9.5)

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