10/2017 Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic_10142017_12:53

Phase II: The Needs Assessment School Diagnostic

Ft Wright Elementary School
Tina Wartman
501 Farrell Dr
Covington, Kentucky, 41011
United States of America

Last Modified: 11/06/2017
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

eProve diagnostics

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?

The process used for reviewing, analyzing, and applying data results take place weekly in a variety of settings to include all stakeholders and ensure all students are making progress. The analyzed data is used to determine professional learning needs of staff along with interventions/ accelerations needed for students. The data reviewed is K-PREP data, MAP data, Brigance data, Common Assessment data, Writing scrimmages, and formative and summative classroom data. The following describes who reviews data, the frequency, and documentation: SBDM Council (monthly- minutes); Professional Learning Communities (PLCs- weekly- data charts); CSIP Strategy Meetings (monthly-minutes); Committee meetings (PBIS & Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment- monthly or more frequently as needed- minutes); Administrative Meetings (weekly- minutes); Leadership Meetings (monthly)

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 State: 82.1 Achievement score on KPREP Math compared to 78.7 district score. 85.6 Achievement score on KPREP Reading in 2017 compared to 81.3 district score. Writing

Achievement on KPREP steadily improved from 70.5 in 2015 to 76 in 2017. 59% of students are Proficient and/or Distinguished in Math in 2017 compared to the state average of 49%. 66% of students are Proficient and/or Distinguished in Reading in 2017 compared to the state average of A decrease in Novice KPREP Reading and Math students in 2017 compared to 2016. 9% Novice on KPREP Reading in 2017 compared to 13% Novice district score and 22.3% Novice state score. 8% Novice on KPREP Math in 2017 compared to 11% Novice district score and 16.3% Novice state score. 64.2 % of students scored Proficient and/or Distinguished in the area of Language Mechanics in 2017. 66.7% of fifth grade students scored Proficient and/or Distinguished in the area of Math in 2017. Non-Academic Current State: 58% of student population receiving free/reduced lunch status in 2017 from 51.2 % in 2016 according to the school report card. End of the year Average Daily Attendance for 2017 is 96.4 % from 96.3% in 2016 according to the school report card. Program Review scores are Proficient in Arts & Humanities, Practical Living and Career Studies, Writing, and Kindergarten Through Third Grade in 2016 and 2017 according to the school report card. Total membership changed from 78.7% white in 2016 to 76.9% white in 2017 with the hispanic population going up nearly 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.

42% of students in the non-duplicated gap group scored proficient/distinguished in KPREP math compared to 51% in 2016. 49% of students in the non-duplicated gap group scored proficient/distinguished in KPREP reading compared to 52% in 2016. 25% of students scored apprentice in KPREP reading in 2017 compared to 23% of students scored apprentice in KPREP reading in 2016 33% of students scored apprentice in KPREP math in 2017 compared to 27% of students scored apprentice in KPREP math in 2016 40.7% of 4th grade students scored apprentice in KPREP math in 2017 compared to 24.6% of 5th grader students scored apprentice in KPREP math in 2017. 22% of students scored distinguished in KPREP reading in 2017 compared to 27% of students scored distinguished in KPREP reading in 2016. 32% of students with disabilities scored novice in KPREP reading in 2017 compared to 29% in 2016. 26% of students with disabilities scored novice in KPREP math in both 2016 and 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?

Students in the non-duplicated gap group (hispanic, free and reduced lunch status, & students with disabilities) are identified areas for improvement in reading and math. Students with disabilities are identified in novice reduction and improvement in the areas of reading and math. Non-duplicated gap group students need to be identified and progress monitored throughout the school year by the general education teacher. Professional Learning Communities need to focus on targeted students and weekly data progress.

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](#)

Fort Wright will be utilizing Design, Align and Deliver Support Processes with Sub-group Focus. This process will be utilized by tracking students in the non-duplicated gap group (hispanic, free and reduced lunch status, and students with disabilities). Teachers will track weekly assessments and discuss each student in the non-duplicated gap group during every Professional Learning Community (PLC). These assessments and practices will include many other processes listed above.

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%.

Writing instruction has increased from 70.5 in 2015 to 76 in 2017. Language Mechanics improved with 64.2 % of students being proficient and/or distinguished. Novice reduction of free and reduced lunch status population in KPREP math went from 14% in 2016 to 11% in 2017. Novice reduction of free and reduced lunch status population in KPREP reading went from 14% in 2016 to 13% in 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)

eProve diagnostics