

18-19 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Shelby County High School

Margo Whisman
1701 Frankfort Rd
Shelbyville, Kentucky, 40065
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/21/2018

Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	3
Protocol	4
Current State	5
Priorities/Concerns	6
Trends	7
Potential Source of Problem.....	8
Strengths/Leverages	9
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	10

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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

30-60-90 day reporting meetings occur monthly with principal, CAO and Superintendent. Weekly action updates occur with school point people and principal. As achievement data is received, it is reviewed and analyzed by school staff, including each administrator and teacher. A full day of professional development devoted to analyzing school and student data, improvement planning, and developing individual learner plans for success. Teachers meet weekly within departments, PLCs and data teams to analyze live data for all students as well as dis-aggregated data for individual groups. continuously examine data from common formative assessments and MAP results as part of their data team process and in consideration of what is included in the CSIP. The School Improvement Plan is presented and data is discussed and analyzed as a part of each SBDM meeting. Once complete and approved by SBDM & SCPS, the improvement plan is available for review at the school and on the school's website.

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 gap students scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- We saw a 10% increase among gap students in Reading from 2017 to 2018.
- 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 2017 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2016.
- The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 198 in 2018 from 276 in 2017.

Past proficiency data is pulled from EOC assessments. Current proficiency data is pulled from the junior administered ACT. Past 16-17 Algebra II EOC results showed 13.9% of all students scored proficient or distinguished. In 17-18, 27.8% scored proficient or distinguished on ACT math. Only 16% of the consolidated student group, 11.8% of AA students, 13.7% of Hispanic, 4.0% EL plus monitoring, 14.4 % of students in poverty, and 12.5% students with disabilities scored proficient or distinguished. Past 16-17 English II EOC results showed 51.2% of students scored proficient or distinguished on the EOC. In 17-18, 36.0% scored proficient or distinguished on ACT reading. Only 29.4% of AA students, 17.7% of Hispanic, 0.0% EL plus monitoring, 22.9 % of students in poverty, and 10.5% students with disabilities scored proficient or distinguished.

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

86.3% of Hispanic and 96.0% EL plus monitoring, student groups scored below proficiency on ACT Math compared to 72.2% of all students. 82.4% of Hispanic and 100.0% EL plus monitoring, student groups scored below proficiency on ACT Reading compared to 64.0% of all 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?

Math proficiency is a significant area of improvement for all students. Improving proficiency for Hispanic and EL + student groups are areas that need significant improvement in all content areas.

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 Key Core Work Processes outlined below:

[KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards](#)

[KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction](#)

[KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy](#)

[KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data](#)

[KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)

[KCWP 6: Establishing Learning Culture and Environment](#)

Deployment of Standards, Delivery of Instruction, Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with student group focus. One source of the problem was a lack of certified EL teachers serving the needs of the subgroup in the comprehensive high school setting. Resources have been added to address this difference and a certified instructor will start January 2019.

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 Graduation rate continues to be above 90%, above the state average. We continue to meet our Delivery Target and be above the state average in College / Career Readiness (67.0). Community Engagement and Support (86.6%) and School Leadership (90.3%) continue to score well for agree / strongly agree on the TELL survey.

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