

## Phase II: KDE Needs Assessment School Diagnostic\_10092017\_13:06

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

### **Henderson County North Middle School**

Rebecca Johnson  
1707 Second St  
Henderson, Kentucky, 42420  
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/10/2017

Status: Locked

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment .....	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	6

## Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

### 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 shareholder groups involved. How frequently does this planning team meet and how are these meetings documented?

SBDM Council members analyzed data (Justin Fuller, Madelynne Wilhoite, Andrea Smith, Cassandra Best, DaySha McKillop, Teresa Schwallier, Eric Titzer, Bob Shoultz, Natalie Lancaster, Amy Gibson, Nicholas Eastham), all staff analyzed the scores for their department, and teachers analyzed their individual data. Content areas analyze KPREP data once per year, MAP data twice per year, CSA data with each instructional unit, and CFA data multiple times within each unit of study. Minutes are kept for each of these meetings and link to our NMS Landing Page (Google Site).

### **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 non-duplicated gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2015 to 2016.
- 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 2016 schools year – a decrease from 92% in 2015.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2017 from 276 in 2016.
- Reading for all students increased from 52.4% PD to 56.9% PD but delivery target not met -
- Reading for AA students increased from 24.6% PD to 27.0% PD but delivery target not met -
- Reading for Hispanic students increased from 47.4% PD to 54.4% PD but delivery target not met -
- Reading for FR students increased from 43.2% PD to 45.9% PD but delivery target not met -
- Reading for SWD students increased from 14.1% PD to 15.1% PD but delivery target not met -

Reading for Gap Group students increased from 42.9% PD to 45.9% PD but delivery target not met -Math for all students increased from 59.2% PD to 62.3% PD and we met our deliver target -Math for AA students increase from 29.2% PD to 30.2% PD but delivery target not met -Math for Hispanic students increased from 47.4% PD to 56.5% PD but delivery target not met -Math for FR students increased from 49.9% PD to 50.3% PD but delivery target not met -Math for SWD students decreased from 20.0% PD to 19.4% PD and delivery target not met -Math for Gap Group students increased from 49.0% PD to 51.2% PD but delivery target not me -SS for all students increased from 56.6% PD to 62.8% PD but delivery target not met -SS for AA students increased from 59.3% to 65.3% PD but delivery target not met -SS for FR students increase from 48.0% PD to 49.7% PD but delivery target not met -SS for SWD students decreased from 13.8% PD to 6.1% PD and delivery target not met -SS for Gap Group students increased from 47.0% PD to 50.0% PD but delivery target not met -Writing for all students decreased from 44.3% PD to 30.5% PD and delivery target not met -Writing for AA students decreased from 37.2% PD to 13.0% PD and delivery target not met -Writing for FR students decreased from 35.4% PD to 16.1% PD and delivery target not met -Writing for SWD students decreased from 13.6% PD to 0.0% PD and delivery target not met -Writing for Gap Group students decreased from 35.0% PD to 16.5% PD and delivery target not met

## **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 students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

-In writing the percentage of PD students (all students) decreased by 13.8% PD. (44.3% down to 30.5% PD). In writing AA, FR, SWD, and GAP Group all decreased in percentage of PD. -In reading there is a significant negative difference between the performance of all students and AA, FR, and SWD students. -In math there is a significant negative difference between the performance of all students and AA, FR, SWD, and GAP Group students.

## **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?

Writing suffered a severe decline this year. NMS also is not meeting targets although most areas are showing growth.

## **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 school improvement strategies outlined below:

#### [1- Deployment of Standards](#)

[2- Delivery of Instruction](#)

[3- Assessment Literacy](#)

[4- Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results](#)

[5- Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus](#)

[6- Establish a Learning Culture and Environment](#)

Delivery of Instruction is a high leverage point in considering the number of new staff, addition of 1:1 devices, and the new student grouping (cluster grouping). 1. Tight PLC processes-planning effective Tier 1 instruction tied directly to grade level assessments. 2. High student engagement 3. Goal setting with students 4. Monitoring data for Tier 2 intervention and group 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%.

-Since 2014 the percentage of PD in reading has risen from 46.4% PD to 59.6% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD AA in reading has risen from 24.0% PD to 27.0% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD FR in reading has risen from 34.1% PD to 45.9% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD SWD in reading has risen from 8.2% PD to 15.1% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD Gap Group in reading has risen from 33.2% to 45.9% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD in math has risen from 43.8% PD to 62.3% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD AA in math has risen from 19.8% PD to 30.2% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD FR in math has risen from 31.5% PD to 50.3% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD SWD in math has risen from 7.5% PD to 19.4% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of Gap Group in math has risen from 31.0% PD to 51.2% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD in SS has risen from 49.7% PD to 62.8% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD in SS AA has risen from 25.9% PD to 47.8% PD. - Since 2014 the percentage of PD in SS FR has risen from 37.5% PD to 49.7% PD. -Since 2014 the percentage of PD in SS Gap Group has risen from 36.3% PD to 50.0% PD.

## **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)
 Analysis of Data	Data Analysis & Strengths	