

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic_10262017_09:05

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

A B Chandler Elementary School

Brandy Haley
11215 Us Hwy 60 W
Corydon, Kentucky, 42406
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2017

Last Modified: 10/31/2017

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?

Data is reviewed on a weekly basis during PLCs including administration and grade level teachers. During these meetings, specific skills and students are discussed in order to improve instruction and student achievement. During monthly SBDM meetings, data is shared with council members as well as initiatives that address our top priority of improving reading achievement. Both of these meetings are documented through meeting minutes kept in a Google folder

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.

Overall achievement on the KPREP increased by .4 from 2015 - 2017; 89.3 to 89.7. We saw an increase in our overall math scores on the KPREP from 2015 to 2017; 88.3 to 90.4 We saw an increase in our overall language mechanics scores on the KPREP from 2015 - 2017; 94 to 100 We saw an 8.2% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2015 to 2017; 61.1% of non-duplicated gap students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Reading. We saw a 4.6% increase among free/reduced lunch students in Reading from 2015 to 2017; 58.2% of free/reduced lunch students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Reading. We had 0 novices

in Social Studies, 1 novice in On Demand and 2 novices in Language Mechanics on the 2017 KPREP. 69.7% of our students scored proficient or distinguished in math compared to the state average of 49.1%. Non-Academic: Office referrals decreased by 51% from 2016; 2016 - 60 referrals and 31 in 2017. Student attendance was a 96.23% in 2016 and 95.6% in 2017 - a -0.63% from the previous year.

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.

38.9% of students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to 22.9% of non-gap learners. 43.9% of students in free/reduced gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to 24.6% of non-free/reduced learners. 66/7% of students in the disability gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to 29.8% of non-disability learners. 62.5% of students in the disability gap group scored below proficiency on KPREP test in math as opposed to 13% of non-disability learners.

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?

Our behavior data continues to improve from 2016 to 2017, decreasing the number of discipline referrals by 51%. We continue to increase our percentage of proficient/distinguished each year in the area of math; from 2015 to 2017, 62.7 % to 69.7%. We increased our percentage of proficient/distinguished in the area of reading; from 2015 to 2017, 60.8% to 65.8%. Since 2015, we have not met our proficiency target in reading for the non-duplicated gap or free/reduced lunch group. Since 2015, we have not met our proficiency target in math for the students with disabilities. Our attendance percentage has been below our goal of 97% for the past two years. The number of novices in the area of reading has increased over the past 3 years; 2015 = 12, 2016 = 18 and 2017 = 20.

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](#)

Strategy #6: Weekly reading data will be collected, analyzed and used to drive classroom instruction and Tier II interventions that take place in the classroom. Teachers will utilize the data to determine students' needs and measure instructional effectiveness to adjust instruction to improve student achievement.

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%.

Our overall math scores on the KPREP increased from 2015 to 2017; 88.3 to 90.4. Our overall language mechanics scores on the KPREP increased from 2015 - 2017; 94 to 100. Office referrals decreased by 51% from 2016; 2016 - 60 referrals and 31 in 2017. 68.2% of our students scored proficient or distinguished on the 2017 math KPREP. 63.6% of our students scored proficient or distinguished on the 2017 reading KPREP. 82% of our students scored proficient or distinguished on the 2017 social studies KPREP. 79.6% of our students scored proficient or distinguished on the 2017 language mechanics KPREP>

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