

**Niagara 1718 Phase II: The Needs Assessment School
Diagnostic_10162017_09:46**

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

Niagara Elementary School

Paige Onan
13043 Hwy 136 E
Henderson, Kentucky, 42420
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2017

Last Modified: 10/31/2017

Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	5

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?

Niagara SBDM meets monthly to review data and discuss needs assessment based on that data. The group members are principal, 3 classroom teachers and 2 parents. Leadership team also meets as soon as any new data is released to discuss results and needs based on that data. The group members are principal, instructional coach, guidance counselor. The RTI team also meets biweekly to discuss academic and behavior data. The group members are principal, instructional coach, guidance counselor, FRC director, mental health counselor, school psychologist, special education teacher.

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.

Current Academic State: *68.6% of all students scored P/D on 2017 KPREP reading --49.3% of F/R students scored P/D on 2017 KPREP reading --49.3% of non-duplicated gap students scored P/D on 2017 KPREP reading *66.7% of all students scored P/D on 2017 KPREP math --50.7% of F/R students score P/D on 2017 KPREP math --52.1% of non-duplicated gap students scored P/D on 2017 KPREP math

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.

68.8% of all students scored P/D on 2017 KPREP reading as compared to 23.5% of disability with IEP students. 68.5% of all students scored P/D on 2017 KPREP math as compared to 32.4% of disability with IEP 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?

Academic: Reading and Math Behavioral: Serious behavior offenses and office referrals Cultural: Teacher support for behavior

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](#)

Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus

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%.

Language mechanics score has increase from to .

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)
 KPREP overview	Overview sent to staff if scores had equated to points.	