

Phase II: KDE Needs Assessment School Diagnostic_10092017_09:11

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

Henderson County High School

Chad Thompson
2424 Zion Rd
Henderson, Kentucky, 42420
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/10/2017

Status: Open

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?

Data used in all meetings comes from the state report card, formative data, summative data, and benchmark assessment data. Each of these data sets are presented, analyzed, reviewed and used for planning in departments, school wide leadership teams and school council meetings. The ground level assessment of the data begins within each department and is brought to the meetings by the individual teachers to analyze for instructional purposes. Each Wednesday morning the departments meet with their team to review assessments and instructional practices and on Thursday afternoons each department meets in their data teams to review and analyze the data from their assessments and make determinations on student needs based on the assessment data. At least twice a month we meet with a leadership team within the school to review data from different sources to help make school wide decisions. The individual data teams then make a plan each week based on the data as to how to reinforce, spiral back in, or reteach those standards or strands that students seemed to struggle with. Those involved are: Aaron Nelson, Laura Williams, Tracy Stallings, Robin Thacker, Sara Thomas, Chris Huston, Emily Phillips, Scott Hershman, Brain Ettensohn, Lori Fulkerson, Jessica Grace, Ed Clouse, Bob Sexton, Ed Clouse, Adam Nolen, Sara Young, Michelle Barnett, Tammy Ransom, Dawn Kelsey, Natalie Martin, Gloria Young, Matt Richeson, Tiffany Sights, Scotty Martin, Doneta Williams, Amanda Lacer, Chad Thompson

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.

Writing: 14.2% of students that took the writing exam scored novice 62.7% of students that took the writing exam scored Proficient or Distinguished 38.9% of our African American Population scored at Novice up from 19.8% 47.6% of our students with an IEP scored at the Novice level up from 34.4% 21.5% of our non duplicated gap group scored Novice We did see an overall increase of P/D of 62.7% up from 46.1% All areas increase in P/D with he exception of African American and IEP students English II: All areas increase in terms of % of novice performance except IEP. IEP students decreased from 69% to 72.5% Two or more races increased their P/D from 48.3% to 50% G/T increased from 96.8% P/D to 97.9% U.S. History All areas increased novice and decreased P/D Algebra II: African Americas decreased their novice percentages from 46.2% to 31.8% Two or more races decreased their novices from 33.3% to 12.5% Males increased the P/D from 42.3% to 44.5% Females increased the P/D from 47% to 47.6% Two or more races increased the P/D from 40% to 45.8% Free and Reduced increased the P/D from 32.6% to 37.4% IEP students increased the P/D from 6.5% to 7% Non duplicated Gap Group increased P/D from 30.3% to 35.4% Biology; Increase overall P/D from 38.6% to 44.3% African Americans increased P/D from 2.9% to 32.5% Two or more races increased P/D from 4.8% to 32.1% Free and Reduced meal students increased P/D from 26% to 32.3% IEP students increased P/D from 2.8% to 12.2% Non duplicated gap increased P/D from 25.2% to 33.8% Proficiency/Closing the Achievement Gap: We did decrease the percentage of those meeting the P/D in Combined Reading and Math from 57.1% to 53.2% The only area we increased the percentage of P/D in combined Reading and Math was in total IEP students from 11.1% to 11.9% Reading Gap: Each area we decreased our percentage of P/D with the exception of IEP. We increased from 15.7% to 16.7% Math Gap: We did increase our P/D from 44.6% to 45.9% We did increase all areas of P/D in our gap groups with the exception of White non-hispanic from 48.5% to 48.2% and African American from 48.5% to 48.2% Graduation Rate: Graduation Rate increased from 95.7 to 96.5 CCR: CCR decreased from 83.6 to 83.3.

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.

Our biggest areas of concern are Reading and Math. Within each of the areas our Gap Groups are our biggest concerns. Reading: African American percent of P/D went from 41.5% to 23.1% Free/ Reduced percent of P/D went from 57.9% to 49.6% IEP students increase from 15.7% to 16.7% but is still an area of concern Gap Group overall decreased form 57.6% P/D to 49% P/D Math: African Americans decreased in P/D from 18.2% to 15.4% P/D CCR: CCR decreased form 83.6 to 83.3

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?

The biggest concerns for our data trends are our gap groups and the continuing widening of the gaps and how to decrease those gaps within each group. We also know that our gap groups are continuing to grow in numbers and how to reallocate our resources to help the gap groups close the gap.

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](#)

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

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%.

Graduation rate is has increase the last 3 years from 93.9% to 96.5% CCR has always been a point to strength for HCHS with a total of 83.3% meeting that benchmark ACT has been a point of increase steadily over the last few years by exceeding the state % and average scores in all areas and composite. Math is an area that we are increasing with at EOC total of P/D up from 45.5% to 45.9% with our Gap math scores increasing from 44.6% P/D to 45.9% P/D Writing is also an area of strength. We did have a dramatic increase in P/D for 46.1% to 62.7%, despite the % of novice increasing, we did increase the % of Proficient drastically. Biology is an area of growing strength. We did increase the percentage of Biology P/D from 38.6% to 44.3%. The biggest leverage and strength within these scores are the fact that all areas of Gap we increased our percentage of P/D.

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