

**HCS 2017-18 Phase II: The Needs Assessment District
Diagnostic_10022017_10:13**

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic

Henderson County
Marganna Stanley
1805 Second St
Henderson, Kentucky, 42420
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/13/2017
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	8

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District 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 results are reviewed and analyzed at district leadership level and school level as results become available. Schools share data with SBDM Councils and staffs and district shares data with school level administration and school board. School leaders and teachers analyze data within weekly PLC meetings. District leadership meets twice monthly and more frequently as needed; SBDM Councils meet monthly and school board meets at least monthly. Meetings are documented through minutes, Google docs; board meetings are streamed live as well. Internal data sources such as individual classroom data, Infinite Campus/SWIS data/AESOP (behavior, attendance, etc.), NWEA MAP data, ACT data, KPREP data, college/career readiness data, graduation rate, district common assessments, surveys from staff and students such as Gallup and Bright Bytes, walkthrough data, MUNIS data, and other data at the school and district level were also used. While this data can show us points in time, trends, and longitudinal information from various perspectives, there are many other aspects of our school system, such as the relationships among students and staff, that are less tangible but definitely have an impact.

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.

-As a district our middle school students have met delivery targets for 3 consecutive years in math with a 68.1% proficient/distinguished on KPREP in 2017, and improved from baseline of 49.3% in 2013. -Middle school reading for non-duplicated gap group has improved from a baseline of 37.0% in 2013 to 49.6% proficient/distinguished on KPREP in 2017; high school reading for non-duplicated gap group has improved from a baseline of 40.6% to 48.0% in reading based on English II EOC as of 2017. -Elementary math percentage of proficient/distinguished has improved from baseline of 53.8% in 2013 to 61% in 2017 on KPREP. -High school math percentage of proficient/distinguished has improved from baseline of 18.9% in 2013 to 42.3% in 2017 on Algebra II EOC. -Elementary free/reduced percentage of proficient/distinguished in math has improved from baseline of 44.5% to 52.6% in 2017 on KPREP. -Delivery targets for both free/reduced and non-duplicated gap groups were met in 2017 for middle school math as well as for all students, female students and white students. -Middle school female students have improved in math in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 51.0% in 2013 to 74.7% in 2017 on KPREP. -Middle school African American students have improved in math in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 27.0% in 2013 to 45.3% in 2017 on KPREP; Hispanic students have improved in math from baseline of 49.3% to 63.5% in 2017 on KPREP; free/reduced lunch have improved from baseline of 38.1% to 58.0% in 2017 on KPREP; non-duplicated gap group has improved from 37.8% to 58.1%. -High school female students have improved in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 14.0% in 2013 to 43.0% in 2017 on Algebra II EOC. -In science African American students have improved in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 13.5% in 2013 to 31.7% in 2017. In social studies middle school students have improved in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 54.7% in 2013 to 62.7% in 2017 on KPREP. In elementary social studies Hispanic students have improved in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 36.4% to 59.1% in 2017 on KPREP; students with disabilities have improved from baseline of 31.8% to 40.6% in 2017 on KPREP. -In middle school social studies African American students have improved from baseline of 30.3% in 2013 to 50.0% in 2017 on KPREP. -In writing elementary students have improved in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 40.8% to 58.4% in 2017 on KPREP. High school students have improved in writing from a baseline of 47.0% to 59.0% in 2017 on KPREP. - In elementary writing African American students have improved in percentage of proficient/distinguished from a baseline of 33.8% to 51.2% in 2017 on KPREP. Free/reduced have improved from 33.% to 51.2%; students with disabilities have improved from 24.4% to 30.4%, and non-duplicated gap group has improved from 33.6% to 50.2%. -In middle school writing Hispanic students have improved in percentage of proficient/distinguished from 35.5% to 44.4% in 2017 on KPREP. -In high school free/reduced students have improved from 32.2% percentage proficient/distinguished in writing to 44.3% in 2017 on KPREP; non-duplicated gap group from 31.7% to 43.6% in 2017. -Based on 2017 ACT data our Hispanic students are above percentages of state in meeting CPE benchmarks in English 52.9% compared to 39.4% for state; 35.3% to 29.2% in math; and 47.1% to 38.5% in reading. Based on 2017 Advanced Placement data we have 53.92% of our students with scores of 3+ on exams as compared to state with 49.71% as well as all sub-populations (male, female, African American, two or more races, free/reduced, and non-duplicated gap groups) with a higher percentage than the state. From the fall of 2015 to spring of 2017 5 percent more of our students are on/above grade level in reading based on MAP from 63% to 68%; in math we have a 7 percent improvement from 64% to 70%. Based on 2017 TELL survey data, 88.8% of staff agree/strongly agree we have community engagement and support; 88.6% agree/strongly agree we have quality school leadership. In 2017 we had 11.8% of new and KTIP (KY Teacher Internship Program) teachers. In 2017 we had 18.4% teacher turnover per Infinite Campus reporting.

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.

We have identified schools that have not met gap delivery targets for two years and included that in the assurance; for this we will focus on district level priorities/concerns. -Elementary reading scores have become stagnant at 60.2%, 61.2%, and 61.0% proficient/distinguished since 2015 on KPREP. Specific gap groups that are performing well below all students are English learners (25.0% P/D); disability (32.4%). -Middle school reading concerns include African Americans performing at 36.5% P/D on 2017 KPREP; English learners at 12.5% P/D and students with disabilities at 15.3% P/D. -High school reading concerns include African Americans performing at 25.0% P/D and students with disabilities at 16.3% P/D on English II EoC in 2017. -Elementary math concerns include no delivery targets being met for 2016-17. -Middle school math delivery targets were not met for African Americans, Hispanic, EL, or disability in 2017. -At the high school level in math, delivery targets were met for female and white students, but were not met for males, African Americans, free/reduced, disability, or non-duplicated gap groups. -In high school science concerns include no delivery targets being met for 2016-17. -In 2017 elementary social studies, the only group that met delivery target was Hispanic students. No delivery targets were met at middle school level or high school level. -In 2017 only female students and white students met delivery targets in writing; no groups met delivery targets at middle school level, and only female students met delivery target at high school level. As a district our College and Career Readiness dropped from 81.2% in 2016 to 75.6% in 2017. As a district our Graduation Rate dropped from 91.1% in 2016 to 89.8% in 2017 based on 4-year cohort; the only group to meet delivery target was female 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?

See attachment regarding schools and student groups that have not met delivery targets for two years in academic content areas. Between years 2014-2016 our district reduced our budget by \$7 million which has impacted teacher turnover as well as number of new/KTIP teachers. Our reading performance has become somewhat stagnant as reflected in multiple pieces of data at various levels (KPREP, MAP).

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](#)

One of the primary areas of focus for our district is primary reading. We have included district and school leadership, instructional coaches, and classroom teachers in an extensive project which includes research, data analysis, and professional learning. This group has created a district-wide common assessment to be used with all students in grades K-3 throughout the school year to determine specific strengths and areas for improvement with individual students, grade levels, and school/district wide. In addition, a position for a primary reading specialist has been created and filled. We are focusing on the 5 components of reading in instruction, with model teachers demonstrating and videotaping lessons for school/district leadership and teachers. Leadership is monitoring through observations. In addition we are focusing on our gap groups as we know this is an area of need in improving academic performance for all students in all content areas by increasing proficiency. District leadership meets with each school individually to analyze data, keep abreast of current information regarding assessment and accountability and determine areas of strength and need to which the district can provide support and assistance.

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%.

Post-secondary readiness is the expectation (tours, careers days); building character within students and creating leaders (Leader in Me process); emphasis on soft skills; community focused; early identification of student needs (special education, gifted, RTI, basic needs); steady progress in math achievement; systematic RTI across all schools; strong literacy foundation; differentiation in classroom instruction; accessible curriculum; a strong bond among all levels (elementary, middle, high, district) - good relationships; nearing completion of new school project (elementary school); use of funds for multiple projects with Nickel Tax funds; district broadening scope of student needs; each school is fostering a culture of ownership; CCR well above state average; sustaining and adding to the achievements as measured by the ACT; use of Math in Focus-- curriculum and alignment; community support and Colonels to College as valuable resources; district provides instructional coaches at each school; professional learning for all teachers and staff; district-wide staff appreciation night with food, games, prizes; district-wide Ultimate Challenge Events among schools to foster relationships through staff engagement and promote health/wellness; use of social media; implementation for 1:1 initiative achieved at grades 5-8 with addition of many technological resources and professional learning opportunities; participation in PIMSER ASSESS grant for new science assessment system with K-8 teachers/administrators; Next Generation Leadership Network participation with P-12 teachers/administrators/instructional coaches and KDE; communication with families and community through social media at school/district levels. To sustain these areas of strength, we will focus on our people and our climate/culture. By embedding continuous professional learning, we will also build capacity within our schools/district and focus on recruitment and retention of quality staff members. We will continue celebrations and recognition as we model transparency and innovation. We know that continued communication and vertical alignment are keys for district improvement as a whole. There is cause to celebrate our academic success as well as our progress in moving to be more technologically innovative. We use social media to "get the word out" about our individual schools. We consistently celebrate our people and their accomplishments and achievements. In addition, we look forward to

the completion of a new elementary school in the fall of 2018. Another opportunity for improvement has been to improve school safety by installing Ident-a-kid software and hardware requiring all visitors to provide photo identification; the software is linked to law enforcement data bases to identify any potential dangers to the school.

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)
 Delivery Targets	Identification of schools and groups by content areas that have not met delivery targets for two years.	,