

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools 2018-19

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Martha Layne Collins High School

Joseph Ellison, III
801 Discovery Blvd
Shelbyville, Kentucky, 40065
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/21/2018

Status: Open

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?

Data review and analysis is infused in the instructional work of Martha Layne Collins High School. Course specific data teams (comprised of common course teachers, instructional coaches, and school administrators) meet three (3) times each month to discuss common balanced assessments (formative and summative assessments which are aligned to state academic standards) and determine the best instructional strategies to use in response to the data (either in intervention work or whole class instruction). This work is documented on written data protocols which are housed in Google Drive. Data review is completed in data teams in a spiral fashion so that the team's focus remains on all students mastering necessary course standards. Remediation strategies are created and generated as a result of data team balanced assessment analysis. The Site-Based Decision Making Council is regularly updated on students' academic and career attainment progress through reports from the principal in regular, monthly meetings. A comprehensive review of the K-PREP data, ACT data, and Transition Readiness data are conducted when that data is first received. The school's administrative team meets weekly and focuses two meetings a month on school academic data and how to best support teachers' responses to student-level data. Finally, the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meets monthly. This team is comprised of all department chairs, the 8th grade team leaders, the administrative team, the instructional coaches, and the library/media specialist. A portion of this meeting is focused upon a review of current academic progress and discuss of the supports needed by teachers to enable effective responses to student-level data.

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.

The following academic data analysis provides comparative data despite the fact that assessment data from 2017 comes from a different assessment than in 2014, 2015, and 2016. - 48.1% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on Reading proficiency, as opposed to 39% in 2016, 43.2% in 2015, and 41.5% in 2014. - 39.7% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on Math proficiency, as opposed to 17.5% in 2016, 18.5% in 2015, and 14.1% in 2014. - The school's Proficiency index is 61.3, compared to state average of 59.3. - The school's Transition Readiness index is 75.8, compared to state average of 60.9. - The school's Graduation Rate is 95.2%, compared to state average of 90.8%. - 19.7 average composite ACT score compared to state average of 19.3 in 2017, a decrease of 1.3. Non-Academic - Teacher attendance rate was 81.53% for the 2017 school year -- a decrease from 93.7% in 2016. - The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 2309 in 2018 from 3919 in 2017.

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.

Academic: - 75.6% of consolidated gap students scored below proficiency in reading as opposed to 52% of non-gap learners. - 85.1% of consolidated gap students scored below proficiency in math as opposed to 60.3% of non-gap learners. - 83.1% of consolidated gap students scored below proficiency in science as opposed to 60.7% of non-gap learners. - Teacher attendance rate was 81.53% for the 2017 school year -- a decrease from 93.7% in 2016. - The number of behavior referrals has decreased to 2309 in 2018 from 3919 in 2017.

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?

- 19.7 average composite ACT score compared to state average of 19.3 in 2017, a decrease of 1.3 from 2016. - The Proficiency index of EL students is 8.1, compared to state average of 59.3. - The Transition Readiness index of EL students is 40, compared to state average of 60.9. - The Graduation Rate of EL students is 76.9%, compared to state average of 90.8%. The following academic data analysis provides comparative data despite the fact that assessment data from 2017 comes from a different assessment than in 2014, 2015, and 2016. - 48.1% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on Reading proficiency, as opposed to 39% in 2016, 43.2% in 2015, and 41.5% in 2014. - 39.7% of all students scored proficient/distinguished on Math proficiency, as opposed to 17.5% in 2016, 18.5% in 2015, and 14.1% in 2014.

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](#)

KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction KCWP 4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data KCWP 5: Design, Align, and Deliver Support Focus will be placed on improving instructional practice in every classroom to address the needs of every students. Data analysis of balanced assessments will occur in data teams and will be used to drive instructional, intervention, remediation, and enrichment decisions. Teachers will be support by instructional coaches and administrators to ensure classroom instruction is targeted to addressing the results of balanced assessments and students' needs. Additional, school staff will investigate and implement additional support that can be provided to increase the achievement levels of EL students. An identified source of challenge for the EL+monitored subgroup comes with the lack of personnel support provided to support these learners. Only one (1) EL Instructional Assistant has been allocated by the district to support his subgroup. The school has allocated fund to acquire one (1) additional EL Instructional Assistant. Still, these two classified staff members are not able to effective address the needs of all EL students in our school.

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%.

The following are strengths when compared to state scores: - The school's Proficiency index is 61.3, compared to state average of 59.3. - The school's Transition Readiness index is 75.8, compared to state average of 60.9. - The school's Graduation Rate is 95.2%, compared to state average of 90.8%. - 19.7 average composite ACT score compared to state average of 19.3 in 2017, a decrease of 1.3. - The Graduation Rates increased from 93.0% to 95.2% over the last five years.

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