Phase Two: EHS Needs Assessment

Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Elizabethtown High School
Jennifer Burnham
620 N Mulberry St
Elizabethtown, Kentucky, 42701
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 10/28/2018
Last Modified: 10/30/2018
Status: Locked

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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?

1. Academic data from 2017-18 school year was analyzed at district administrative meeting to look for patterns over time and tentatively determine areas of need. This meeting included Jon Ballard, superintendent, Kelli Bush, associate superintendent, Shellee Godfrey DAC, and other schools' principals. 2. Academic data will be analyzed in a department head meeting with the principal and assistant principal and at PLC meetings that will include a member of the administrative team, including Jennifer Burnham, principal, BJ Henry, assistant principal for instruction, and Karl Olive, assistant principal. 3. Data will be presented to SBDM members: Amy Inman, Andy Games, Sheldon Lackey (parents), and Rhonda Wilson, Jessica Jones, Deanna Lively, and Corey Yates (teachers.) They will also discuss the findings from the district and departmental analysis. 4. These teams will continue to meet once every 9 weeks to examine and evaluate the success of any steps taken to bring all students to proficiency and college or career ready. 5. Data to be analyzed will include previous years' school report card information, current accountability data, Iowa Test of Basic Skills and, Star 360. All of this information will be compiled into a spreadsheet by grade level to aid in determining who needs academic interventions. 6. Documentation will be through data spreadsheets and minutes from 30,60,90 meetings with building administrative staff and Kelli Bush, Associate Superintendent for Student Learning as we examine progress on CSIP goals.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

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.

Current Academic State: Proficiency overall - 66.7 which is 26.7 above the cut score Transition readiness overall - 71.4 which is 30.4 above the cut score Graduation Rate - 97.7 which is 12.7 above the cut score Proficiency - African American - 40.3 which is .3 above the cut score Reading - 45.5 which is 5.5 above the cut score Math - 35 which is 5 below the cut score Transition Readiness - 52 which is 11 above cut score Graduation Rate - 95.9 which is 10.9 above the cut score Proficiency - Free/Reduced - 50.4 / 10.4 above the cut score Reading - 58/18 above the cut score Math - 42.8/2.8 above the cut score Transition Readiness - 56.3/15.3 above the cut score Graduation Rate - 95.6/10.6 above the cut score Proficiency Disability - 22/18 below the cut score Reading 32.2/7.8 below the cut score Math - 11.8/28.2 below the cut score Transition Readiness and Graduation Rate - not enough students to count *We have been labeled a TSI school for our students with IEPs based on 2017-18 accountability data for students with disabilities. We currently have 213 seniors with 126 of them academic ready and six career ready but 81 neither academic or career ready. Non-Academic Current State: Behavior referrals are down from **** this time of year in 2017-18 to ****for the current school year. *2017-18 Behavior Events were as follows: White of the total population = of events Black of the total population = of events FreeReduced of the total population = of events Special Ed of the total population = of events Males 52% of the total population = 73% of events Females 48% of the total population = 27% of events

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.

*Not only are our students with IEPs scoring 44.7 points below all students at EHS in the category of proficiency - they are scoring 18 points below the cut score for the state. *They are below the state cut score in reading and math - 7.8 and 28.2 points respectively. *Students with IEPs scored 22.5 points below All Students at EHS in reading and 36 points below All Students in math at EHS. *Math is an area of concern for our African American students who scored 5 points below the cut score and our Free/Reduced students who were only 2.8 points above the cut score. *Our district average for behavior events for African American students is 33% but they only make up 13% of our students. Behavior events for special education students more double their population 29/12%.

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?

ACT data from the last five years indicates we are not closing the gap for our minority and free/reduced lunch students. Academic and behavioral data indicate Gap students receive more office referrals and score lower in academic areas. Our students with disabilities are the only sub-group that scores below the state average in any year we have had enough students to count. Our white and Asian students typically score well above the state averages on mandated assessments and ACT benchmarks indicating core instruction for average and above average students is solid.

ATTACHMENTS
Please be sure to upload the files in the Attachments section at the end of the diagnostic.

eProve diagnostics

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](#)

We will focus on KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support We have a model in place to provide supports for 9th and 10th grade students who score in the 15th percentile or lower in reading and/ or math on the Star 360 assessment. However, this system is not helping students make the gains they need. Our students with IEPs in the 9th and 10th grade also receive supports through co-taught classes in math and English as well as resource twice a week. Our assessment data indicates these interventions are not working.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

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 percent of students meeting benchmark in English on the ACT has increased from 64.9 to 70.9 over the last 4 years. *Students meeting benchmark in reading on the ACT has increased from 59.4 percent to 66.5 in the last 4 years. *Graduation rate has increased from 91.1 in 2013 to 97.7 in 2018.

<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>

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