

**October 2017 Phase II: KDE Needs Assessment School
Diagnostic_10092017_10:14**

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

Woodland Middle School
Jerry Cline
5399 Old Taylor Mill Rd
Taylor Mill, Kentucky, 41015
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/03/2017
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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?

Woodland analyzes data throughout the school year. Data is analyzed with all stakeholders and occurs during professional development sessions, PLC meetings, District Curriculum and Assessment meetings, SBDM meetings and during specific content PLC meetings. Individual student data is analyzed weekly during grade level and/or content specific PLC meetings. Formative and summative assessment data is reviewed for individual students with teachers, administrators and district consultants. Based on the data, interventions and instructional strategies are discussed and listed. Annually, we meet as a staff to review state assessment scores in a professional development session. During this session, areas of concern are identified by teachers and students who fall into this concern are identified and a plan of action for these students is created to improve learning which will lead to improved scores. Monthly, the leadership team meets with district consultants to review data and determine instructional recommendations for staff and school. The Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) team meets monthly to review expectations and to analyze discipline data. Discipline data is shared with all staff on a monthly basis and data is compared to previous years. The school level RBTL team meets weekly to review attendance and behavior data and identify students in need of an intervention.

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.

Academic: -49.1% of all students scored proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP Math compared to the state average of 47% and district average of 54.2% -34.2% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP Math. We saw a .3% decrease among non-duplicated gap students in Math from 2015 to 2016. This is 1.7% below the state average and 3.5% below the district average. -14.9% of disability with IEP scored a proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP math. We saw a 3.7% increase among disability with IEP students in Math from 2015 to 2016. This is 5% below the state average and 1.4% above the district average. -56% of all students scored proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP Reading compared to the state average of 56.9% and district average of 60%. -42.6% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP Reading. We saw a 1.8% increase among non duplicated gap students in reading from 2015 to 2016. This is 3.9% below the state average and 2.7% below the district average. -16.8% of disability with IEP scored a proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP reading. We saw a 1.8% increase among disability with IEP students in reading from 2016 to 2017. This is 9.6% below the state average and .9% below the district average. -39.3% of all students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP Writing compared to the state average of 37.2% and district average of 47.9%. -26.4% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on KPREP writing. We saw a 1.6% increase among non duplicated gap students in writing from 2016 to 2017. This is 1.2% below the state average and 5.6% below the district average. -8% of disability with IEP scored a proficient or distinguished on KPREP writing. We saw a .2% decrease among disability with IEP students in writing from 2016 to 2017. This is 2.6% below the state average and .5% above the district average. -59.4% of all students scored proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP Social Studies compared to the state average of 60.5% and district average of 64.9%. -44.6% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP Social Studies. We saw a 9.2% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Social Studies from 2016 to 2017. This is 4.8% below the state average and 2.4% below the district average. -16% of disability with IEP scored a proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP Social Studies. We saw a 1% increase among disability with IEP students in Social Studies from 2015 to 2016. This is 7.6% below the state average and 2.7% above the district average. In the area of Reading for all students, overall 14.6% of the students scored Distinguished and 40.9% of the students scored Proficient in 2017 on KPREP. This is a 1.2% decrease in Distinguished from 2016 and a 2.8% increase in Proficient from 2016. - In Reading 9.3% of non-duplicated gap students scored Distinguished in Reading on KPREP in 2017. We saw a 1.4% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2016 to 2017 -In Reading 32.3% of non-duplicated gap students scored Proficient in Reading on KPREP in 2017. We saw a .9% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Reading from 2016 to 2017. - In the area of Math for all students, overall 12.8% of the students scored Distinguished and 35.9% of the students scored Proficient in 2017 on KPREP. This is a 4.2% decrease in Distinguished from 2016 and a 2.9% increase in Proficient from 2016. -In Math, 6.3% of non-duplicated gap students scored Distinguished in Math on KPREP in 2017. We saw a 1.1% decrease among non-duplicated gap students in Math from 2016 to 2017. -In Math, 27.3% of non-duplicated gap students scored Proficient in Math on KPREP in 2017. We saw a .4% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Math from 2016 to 2017. -In the area of Social Studies for all students, overall 18.5% of the students scored Distinguished and 40.5% of the students scored Proficient in 2017 on KPREP. This is a 5.9% increase in Distinguished from 2016 and a .7% decrease in Proficient from 2016. -In Social Studies, 8.8% of non-duplicated gap students scored Distinguished in Social Studies on KPREP in 2017. We saw a 4.5% increase among non-duplicated gap students scoring Distinguished in Social Studies from 2016 to 2017. -In Social Studies, 35.2% of non-duplicated gap students scored Proficient in Social Studies on KPREP in 2017. We saw a 4.8% increase among

non-duplicated gap students scoring Proficient in Social Studies from 2016 to 2017. -In the area of Writing, overall 15.8% of all students scored Distinguished and 23% of the students scored Proficient in 2017 on KPREP. We saw 6.7% increase of students scoring Distinguished in Writing from 2016 to 2017. We saw a 7.8% decrease of students scoring Proficient in Writing from 2016 to 2017. -In Writing, 10.4% of non-duplicated gap students scored Distinguished in Writing on KPREP in 2017. We saw a 6.9% increase among non-duplicated gap students scoring Distinguished in Writing from 2016 to 2017 In Writing, 15.2% of non-duplicated gap students scored Proficient in Writing on KPREP in 2017. We saw a 6% decrease among non-duplicated gap students scoring Proficient in Writing from 2016 to 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 students in non-duplicated gap scored below proficiency on KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

-34.2% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP Math. We saw a .3% decrease among non-duplicated gap students in Math from 2016 to 2017. This is 1.7% below the state average and 3.5% below the district average -56% of all students scored proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP Reading compared to the state average of 56.9% and district average of 60%. -42.6% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP Reading. We saw a 1.8% increase among non duplicated gap students in reading from 2016 to 2017. This is 3.9% below the state average and 2.7% below the district average. -16.8% of disability with IEP scored a proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP reading. We saw a 1.8% increase among disability with IEP students in reading from 2016 to 2017. This is 9.6% below the state average and .9% below the district average. -39.3% of all students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2017 KPREP Writing compared to the state average of 37.2% and district average of 47.9%. -26.4% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on KPREP writing. We saw a 1.6% increase among non duplicated gap students in writing from 2016 to 2017. This is 1.2% below the state average and 5.6% below the district average. -44.6% of non duplicated gap students scored a proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP Social Studies. We saw a 9.2% increase among non-duplicated gap students in Social Studies from 2016 to 2017. This is 4.8% below the state average and 2.4% below the district average. -16% of disability with IEP scored a proficient or distinguished on 2016 KPREP Social Studies. We saw a 1% increase among disability with IEP students in Social Studies from 2016 to 2017. This is 7.6% below the state average and 2.7% above the district average.

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?

Academic: Increasing the Proficient and Distinguished students in Reading for all students remains an area for improvement. 2015: 49.5 2016: 55.2 2017: 56.0, although growth has been made each year this still remains an area for improvement due to the fact that the 2016 KPREP reading result is still .9% below the state average and 4% below the district average. Increasing the Proficient and Distinguished students in Reading for non duplicated gap students remains an area for

improvement. 2015: 38.9 2016: 40.8 2017: 42.6, although growth has been made each year this still remains an area for improvement due to the fact that the 2016 KPREP reading for non duplicated gap students result is still 3.9% below the state average and 2.7% below the district average. Increasing the Proficient and Distinguished students in Math for all students remains an area for improvement. 2015: 43.7 2016: 50.7 2017: 49.1, 1.6% decrease in KPREP math from 2015 to 2016. The 2016 KPREP math result is 2.1% above the state average and 5.1% below the district average. Increasing the Proficient and Distinguished students in Math for non duplicated gap students remains an area for improvement. 2015: 30.2 2016: 34.5 2017: 34.2, .3% decrease in KPREP math from 2015 to 2016. The 2016 KPREP math result for non duplicated gap students is 1.7% below the state average and 3.5% below the district average.5

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](#)

1 - Deployment of Standards, 2 - Delivery of Instruction, 3 -Assessment Literacy, 4 - Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results, and 5 - Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus -All certified teachers will create a data notebook that will include Lesson Plans, Formative/Summative Assessments, Student Data, Evaluation Information -Lesson Plans- teacher submit weekly lesson plans for review by the leadership team. The leadership team will provide lesson plan feedback a minimum of one time monthly. Feedback will be specific and based on Tier I instruction and effective interventions. -Formative/Summative Assessments - Teachers are creating mid-point (formative) and summative assessments that are directly aligned to standards. The assessments will be reviewed by leadership team weekly at PLC meetings. -Student Data - Classroom and individual student data will be kept in a student data file. The data will include KPREP, MAP, and summative and formative assessments. Formative and summative assessment data will be input in the data tool and teachers will be required to analyze and review weekly with the leadership team. On the data file teachers will identify students who are not meeting proficiency on the formative and summative assessments. From this data, teachers will develop a plan of action for the identified students that includes re-teaching of the standard(s) addressed on the summative and formative assessments. -Evaluation Information - All required evaluation documents are required to be included in the teacher notebook. Professional Practices Growth plans must be directly tied to the teacher's area of growth. The PPR document is an on-going document and evidence can be listed anytime throughout the year. -Professional Learning Community (PLC) Meetings - all PLC meetings will be focused on student achievement and instructional strategies. Student specific data will be reviewed weekly. Instructional strategies and interventions will be listed and monitored to ensure students are improving. -Core Instruction for All Students - Student schedules will be reviewed to make sure all students are receiving Tier I instruction in addition to Tier II and/or Tier III as needed. -Response to Instruction (RTI) - Students not meeting grade level standards, will receive Tier II and/or Tier III instruction at a minimum of 25 minutes per day. The data is reviewed bi-weekly and feedback is provided as needed. -A

continuous goal setting structure in which teachers are conferencing with students to review results of formative and summative assessments including MAP and KPREP results and creating a plan of action will be implemented.

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%.

-KPREP Reading results for all students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 49.5% in 2014 to 56.0% in 2016. -KPREP Math results for all students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 43.7% in 2014 to 49.1% in 2016. -KPREP Writing results for all students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 35.1% in 2014 to 39.3% in 2016. -KPREP Social Studies results for all students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 51.9% in 2014 to 59.4% in 2016. -KPREP Reading results for non duplicated gap students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 38.9% in 2014 to 42.6% in 2016. -KPREP Math results for non duplicated gap students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 30.2% in 2014 to 34.2% in 2016. -KPREP Writing results for non duplicated gap students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 24.6% in 2014 to 26.2% in 2016. -KPREP Social Studies results for non duplicated gap students, percent proficient and distinguished has increased from 37.9% in 2014 to 44.6% in 2016.

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