

November 1, 2018 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Districts

Kenton County
Henry Webb
1055 Eaton Dr
Fort Wright, Kentucky, 41017
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/30/2018
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 Districts

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?

Kenton County School District data to identify needs is evaluated in a variety of venues, involving many departments beyond our Academic Support Department. While the Academic Support Department reviews data with district level administrators and consultants at monthly Academic Support meetings, and with school level leadership at CIA (Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment) meetings, we find it even more valuable to gather input and perspective from a variety of different groups throughout the district. Data and input is discussed, and plans are made at the Director's Meetings where approximately 13 Directors, Executive Directors, Assistant Superintendents, and the Superintendent come together for collaboration. Plans for improvement are further focused on in weekly District Cabinet meetings where leadership from each of the departments along with our Superintendent. Input is gathered through consultation with school, district, and community stakeholders in the improvement process. Both school and district data, as well as plans for improvement are discussed in Board meetings with the members of the Board of Education. Further improvement planning and discussions of data occur between district and school level leadership teams through our monthly Principal/Assistant Principal meetings and level-specific Summits. Data is a primary focus for all of our work in order to improve learning opportunities for our students.

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.
- ACT composite- District 20.5 (State 19.3) • % met benchmark on ACT English District 59.1% (State 51.2%)/ Math District 52.1% (State 38.9%)/ Reading District 53.7% (State 47.1%) • Advanced Placement- % scoring 3, 4, or 5 District 68.6% (National 59%) • Graduation Rate- District 93% (State 91.3%) • High School Transition Ready rate- District 62% (State 60.9%) • Middle School Proficiency- District 78.2 (State 72.8) • Middle School Growth- District 13.1 (State 12.1) • Middle School Separate Academic Indicator- District 74.0 (State 66.8) • Elementary School Proficiency- District 80.5 (State 70.5) • Elementary School Growth- District 17.8 (State 17.1) • Elementary School Separate Academic Indicator- District 74.9 (State 64.8) • Attendance- District 95.8% (State 94.4%)

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.

In Proficiency: - High School students with disabilities below state in math (8% PD/8.4%) - Middle School students with disabilities below state in reading (16.9% PD/26.2%) and math (11.8%PD/18%) - Elementary School students with disabilities below state in reading (31.9% PD/35.2%) and math (25%PD/27.9%) In Growth: - 3 Middle schools in bottom 50% of state for growth - 2 Elementary schools in bottom 50% of state for growth In Separate Academic Indicator: - Middle school science students with disabilities 6.1% P/D state 9.9 - Elementary social studies students with disabilities 26.1%P/D state 28.6 In Transition Readiness: - High School students Career-Ready 22% 2018 - High School students with disabilities Transition Ready for District: 9.5% (State 28.4%) In Graduation Rate: - 4 year cohort Graduation rate for students with disabilities 72.1%/ State 78.2% - 4 year cohort Graduation rate for EL students 75%/ State 77.1%

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?

There continues to be a need for improvement in the area of proficiency, growth, separate academic indicators, transition readiness, and graduation rate for our students with disabilities. For example, the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading and Math combined for student with disabilities has declined on the two-year but stayed stagnant overall for the three-year: • Elementary – 27.9% 2016 to 29.7% 2017 to 28.4% 2018 • Middle- 11.8% 2016 to 15.6% 2017 to 14.35% 2018 • High 9.7% 2016 to 14.7% 2017 to 13.15% 2018

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 2- Delivery of Instruction KCWP 3- Assessment Literacy KCWP 4- Review, Analyze, and Apply Data KCWP 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%.

In Proficiency: - High Schools rank 17/168 in the state for proficiency in reading and math (top 10%) - Middle Schools %P/D for Math 53.6% (top 27%) compared to the state 47% - Elementary Schools % P/D for Reading 63.9% (top 16%) compared to the state 54.6% In Growth: - Middle schools rank 39/173 (top 23%) in growth - Elementary schools rank 33/173 (top 19%) in growth In Separate Academic Indicator: - High School science 37.7% P/D as compared to the state 29.6% P/D - Middle School Social Studies – 67.9% P/D as compared to the state 60.2% P/D - Elementary School On Demand Writing 53.5% P/D as compared to the state 40.5 %P/D, with the overall Separate Academic Indicator in the top 14% of the State In Transition Readiness: - 62% Transition-Ready as compared to the state 60.9% Graduation Rate: - 4 year cohort Graduation 93% district compared to 91.3% for the state

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