2018-19 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts_10052018_14:16

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Letcher County
Tony A Sergent
224 Parks Street
Whitesburg, Kentucky, 41858
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/01/2018
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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?

Letcher County Schools' Instructional Department meets weekly to analyze multiple sources of data for improvement planning. This team is comprised of the Superintendent, District Assessment Coordinator, Director of Special Education, and the Director of Curriculum and Instruction. We analyze data from state assessments down to classroom level data. We include non-academic data such as attendance and discipline. We also use the results from our instructional Rounds to determine the needs of our staff and students. Instructional Rounds are completed once in the fall and once in the spring in order to identify next steps for improvement. Our district uses a 30-60-90 day approach to improvement planning and all of our efforts are documented in that plan. We also hold monthly principals' meetings that are truly professional learning communities. We work together to create solutions and share ideas.

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 students have a proficiency score of 68.8%. -Middle school students have a proficiency score of 78.1%. -High School Students have a proficiency score of 58.6%. -Elementary students have a separate academic indicator of 66.4%. -Middle school students have a separate academic indicator of 69.5%. -Our high school has a transition score of 77.8% and a graduation rate of 97.9% for the 5 year cohort and 97.2% for the year cohort. - Elementary students scored 72.7 in reading. -Elementary students who are in Free/reduced lunch gap group scored 70.2 in reading. -Elementary students with disabilities scored 68.9 in reading. -Elementary students scored 64.9 in math. -Elementary students who are in the free/reduced lunch gap group scored 61.8 in math. -Elementary students with disabilities scored 60.3 in math. -Middle school students sored 81.1 in reading. -Middle school students in the free/reduced gap group scored 77.9 in reading. -Middle school students with disabilities scored 71.0 in reading -Middle school students scored 75.1 in math. -Middle school students in the free/reduced gap group scored 71.8 in math. -Middle school students with disabilities scored 69.6 in math. -High school students scored 65.2 in reading. -High school students in the free/reduced gap group scored 59.9 in reading. -High school students with disabilities scored 47.8 in reading. -High school students scored 52.0 in math. -High school students in the free/reduced lunch gap group scored 46.8 in math. -High school math students with disabilities scored 27.4 in math. -Elementary students have a separate academic indicator of 66.4, science being 61.9, social studies being 70.7, and writing 66.6. -Middle school students have a separate academic indicator of 69.5, science being 53.1, social studies being 85.4, and writing 70.1. -Elementary students with disabilities outscored all students in science 66.4 to 61.9. -Middle school free and reduced gap students scored lower than students with disabilities, 49.2 compared to 55.4 in social studies. -Middle school student with disabilities scored 15.7 points lower than all students in writing. -Elementary students showed less growth in math than reading. -Middle school students showed significantly less growth in math than reading. -Elementary students with disabilities showed more growth in math than all students, 13.9 compared to 11.5. -Students with disabilities are 11.1 points behind all students in transition at the high school. -There were zero students with disabilities that earned bonus points for transition at the high school. -Students with disabilities had a graduation rate of 78.3 as compared to 97.2 for the four year cohort. It did grow to 90.6 % for the five year cohort. -54.3% of elementary students were Proficient and Distinguished in Reading, compared to 51.9% of free/reduced students, and 51.0% of students with disabilities. -39.9% of elementary students were Apprentice in math, compared to 41.3% free/reduced students, and 41.1% of students with disabilities. -Only 10% of students were distinguished in math in the elementary. -Only 33.5% of all students were Proficient and/or Distinguished in Science in the elementary. -51.9% of elementary students with disability were Apprentice in science. -54.2% of all elementary students were Apprentice in science. -49.6% of elementary students are

Proficient and/or Distinguished in social studies. -41.4% of elementary students in the free/reduced lunch gap group scored Apprentice in social studies. -40.9% of elementary students with disabilities scored Apprentice in social studies. -12.1% of students with disabilities in the elementary scored Distinguished in social studies compared to 11.1% of all students. -Only 7.6% of students with a disability scored Distinguished in writing at the elementary level. -43.8% of all elementary students scored Proficient or Distinguished in writing. -65.2% of middle school students scored Proficient or Distinguished in reading, with only 13.3% being novice. -54.4% of middle school students with disabilities scores Proficient or Distinguished. -41.6% of all middle school students scored Apprentice in math. -43.6% of middle school student with disabilities scored Apprentice in math. -45.7% of middle school students in the free/reduced gap group scored Apprentice in math. -Only 7.2% of all middle school students scored novice in math. -58% of all middle school students scored Apprentice in Science. -1.2% of all middle school students scored Distinguished in Science. -60.2% of middle school students in the free/reduced gap group scored Apprentice in Science. -55.0% of middle school students with disabilities scored Apprentice in Science. -65.5% of all middle school students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Social Studies. -2.9% of all middle school student were Novice in social studies. -8.8% of middle school students with disabilities scored Novice in Social Studies. Only 5.3% of middle school students with disabilities scored Distinguished in social studies compared to 16.0% of all students. -45.8% of all middle school students scored Proficient or Distinguished in writing. -3.5% of middle school students with disabilities scored Distinguished in writing. -57.9% of middle school students with disabilities scored Apprentice in writing. -17.5% of middle school students with disabilities scored Novice in writing. -45.2% of high school students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Reading. -44.1% of high school students with disabilities scored Apprentice in reading. -32% of high school students with disabilities scored Novice in reading. -30.1% of all high school students scored Novice in math. -68.8% of high school students with disabilities scored Novice in math. -Only 3.9% of all high school students scored Distinguished in math. -49.6% of high school students in the free/reduced gap group scored Apprentice in math. -3.8% of all high school students scored Distinguished in science. -52.4% of high school students scored Apprentice in Science. -61.1% of high school students with disabilities scored Apprentice in Science. -61.9% of all high school students scored Proficient or Distinguished in Writing. -32.4% of high school students with disabilities scored Proficient or Distinguished in Writing. -There were no students with disabilities that scored Distinguished in writing at the high school. -40% of high school students with disabilities scored Apprentice in Writing. -27% of high school students with disabilities scored Novice in writing. -Letcher County Schools had 432 behavior events compared to 423 in 16/17. -We had 156 out of school suspension events compared to 162 in 16/17. -Our average daily attendance for the 17-18 school year was 92.06%. -Our district has two art teachers to server 8 elementary and middle schools, which averages 44 minutes of instruction per week. -We do not have certified PE teachers in our middle and elementary schools, only two at the high school. -We have two librarians to serve all 9 of our schools. -We have four guidance counselors that serve 8 elementary and middle schools. -We have two foreign language teachers at the high school and do not offer any languages at the middle and elementary schools.

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.

39.9% of all elementary students were Apprentice in math. Only 10% of all elementary students were Distinguished in math. 54.2% of all elementary students were Apprentice in Science. 40.9% of elementary students with disabilities were Apprentice in Social Studies. Only 7.6% of elementary students with disabilities were Distinguished in writing. 41.6% of all middle school students were Apprentice in math. 57.9% of middle school students with disabilities were Apprentice in writing. 17.5% of middle school students with disabilities were Novice in writing. 32% of students with disabilities at the high school were Novice in reading. 68.8% of students with disabilities at the high school were Novice in math. 30.1% of all high school students were Novice in math. 52.4% of all high school students were Apprentice in science. 27% of high school students with disabilities were Novice in writing, with zero students with disabilities receiving 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?

Although it is difficult to compare our 2017-18 scores to the previous years because of changes in assessment and accountability, we can look at actually numbers of students and N-A-P-D calculations to identify trends. Our elementary scores continue to be our area for improvement. Moving from 53.3% Proficiency in 2016-17 to 68.8% in 2017-18 looks great, but is misleading because of the different calculations. The reality is that we still only have 42.4% of our elementary students scoring proficient or distinguished in math compared to 42.3% in the 2016-17 school year. Another significant area of improvement is the gap between students with disabilities and all students at the high school in reading and math. Although our ACT has increased by .4 on the composite, our students with disabilities continue to show low performance. 32.4% are novice in reading and 68.8% are novice in math. This gap is even larger than it was on EOC exams.

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

Letcher County Schools will continue to focus on the Design and Delivery of Instruction as well as the Review, Analysis, and Application of data results. The district will reflect, analyze and work to improve Tier 1 and Tier 2 daily instruction to increase rigor and cognitive engagement. Then we will analyze data to set goal or individual students, identifying those most at risk for targeted interventions.

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 science scores are above the state average; 33.5 compared to the state at 30.9. Elementary writing scores are above the state average; 43.8 compared to the state at 40.5. Middle school reading scores are above the state average; 65.2 compared to the state at 60.0. Middle school math scores are above the state average; 51.2 compared to the state at 47.0. Middle school social studies scores are above the state average; 65.5 compared to the state at 60.4. Middle school writing scores are slightly above the state average; 45.8 compared to 44.4 for the state. Our high school graduation rate is 97.9% for the five year cohort and 97.2% for the four year cohort. We have 45.2% proficient and distinguished scores in reading at the high school. 61.9% of high school students are proficient or distinguished in writing.

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)