

## Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic\_10222017\_18:55

Phase II: The Needs Assessment District Diagnostic

**Piner Elementary School**  
Christi Jefferds  
2845 Piner Ridge Rd  
Morning View, Kentucky, 41063  
United States of America

Last Modified: 10/30/2017  
Status: Open

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment .....	3
ATTACHMENT SUMMARY.....	6

## 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?

Each year, our school holds a school wide KPREP Data Analysis PD. It includes all teachers and staff, the FRC Coordinator, and our SBDM Council members. We use the KASC Score and Gap Analyzer tool kit, and identify areas of strength and need. From this, we develop school wide goals for our CSIP. Additionally, data is reviewed throughout the year in a variety of settings. Teachers, both general and special ed, meet weekly in PLCs with the school administrators, and review MAP data following each administration of the test. Additional "data digging" and analysis is completed in PLCs throughout the year. Our RTI team (which includes school administrators, special education teachers, the RTA and Title I teachers, and the Preschool teacher) meets weekly to review classroom RTI data for reading and math, to review Read to Achieve data, Read 180 and System 44 data, and iRead data. Recommendations are made during these meetings regarding the success or lack thereof of the interventions in use. Weekly Student Assistance Team meetings (which include special education teachers, general education teachers, the counselor, administrators, the RTA and Title I teachers, and the FRC Coordinator) are held to provide support and suggestions to teachers who have referred students with whom they have concerns. Often interventions are recommended along with a way to record progress data. Each student's progress data is reviewed every 6 weeks; at times, SAT may refer students for a special ed evaluation. The weekly Special Education team meeting reviews IEP progress data; this meeting includes all special educators, the school psychologist, speech language therapist, and school administrators. These meetings are documented by minutes.

### **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.

-54.8% of non-duplicated gap (NDG) students scored P/D on KPREP Reading; the state NDG average was 45.4%. -We saw a 9% decrease of NDG scoring P on KPREP from 2016 to 2017.

-65.4% of our students scored P/D on KPREP Reading; the state average was 54.3%. -61.8% of our students scored P/D on KPREP Math; the state average was 49.1%. -56.3% of NDG students scored P/D on KPREP Math; the state NDG average was 40.2%.

## **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.

-45.2% of NDG students scored below proficiency on KPREP Reading as opposed to 34.6% of non-gap learners. -50% of NDG students scored below P on KPREP Language Mechanics as opposed to 33.8% of non-gap learners. -48.6% of students with disabilities scored Novice on KPREP reading as opposed to all students, who scored 15.2% Novice. -Only 21.6% of students with disabilities scored P/D on KPREP reading as opposed to all students, of whom scored 65.4% P/D. -In Language Mechanics, 43.8% of students with disabilities and 28.6% of students in the NDG scored Novice, compared to all students, 19.1% of whom scored Novice. -In Language Mechanics, 25% of students with disabilities and 50% of NDG students scored P/D, compared to all students, 66.2% of whom scored P/D. -In Writing, 30% of students with disabilities and 11.6% of students in the NDG scored Novice, compared to all students, 9.4% of whom scored Novice. -In Writing, 20% of students with disabilities and 51.2% of students in the NDG scored P/D, compared to all students, 59.4% of whom scored P/D.

## **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?

-Reading remains a significant area for improvement, as scores have remained stagnant and the gap has increased between NDG students and non-NDG students. -Language Mechanics remains a significant area for improvement, as the gap between all students and those with disabilities has increased to almost 25%.

## **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](#)

4: Review, Analyze, and Apply Data Results. We will begin the Weekly Assessment process in November in the areas of Reading and Math. Teachers will assess one standard at a time following instruction. Teachers will develop instructional plans to remediate students who fail to master the standards, as well as providing extensions/enrichment to students who have. Weekly Assessments will be reviewed prior to administration by the principal/associate principal for standards alignment and appropriate levels of rigor; results will be reviewed weekly in PLCs. Teachers will provide their remediation plans at that time.

## **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%.

-Social Studies NAPD increased from 76.7 in 2016 to 100 in 2017. -Math NAPD increased from 76.7 in 2016 to 85.8 in 2017 -5th grade Math: gap closed to .5 between students in NDG and all students. -Overall achievement score increased from 80.6 (2016) to 87.2 (2017) -In Math, the number of students scoring Novice in the NDG group decreased from 13.2% (2016) to 9.5% (2017) -In Social Studies, students in the NDG group had increase of % P/D from 39.4% (2016) to 76.7 (2017)

## **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)
-----------------	-------------	---------