

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_09132019_13:56

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

McNabb Middle School
Paula Stafford
3570 Indian Mound Dr
Mt Sterling, Kentucky, 40353
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2019
Last Modified: 11/03/2019
Status: Open

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools	3
Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment	4
Protocol	5
Current State	6
Priorities/Concerns	8
Trends	9
Potential Source of Problem.....	10
Strengths/Leverages	11
Attachment Summary	12

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

2019-20 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Understanding Continuous Improvement: The Needs Assessment

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 (e.g. 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 (i.e. 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. 703 KAR 2:225 requires, as part of continuous improvement planning for schools, each school complete the needs assessment between October 1 and November 1 of each year and include: (1) a description of the data reviewed and the process used to develop the needs assessment; (2) a review of the previous plan and its implementation to inform development of the new plan; and, (3) perception data gathered from the administration of a valid and reliable measure of teaching and learning conditions. Further, as required by Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Title I schools implementing a schoolwide program must base their Title I program on a comprehensive 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?

McNabb utilizes a variety of teams and processes for on-going review and analysis of data. The McNabb SBDM Council regularly reviews district benchmark data, such as MAP, and discusses priority needs. MAP data are presented and discussed for disaggregated groups (ethnicity, SES, ELL, special education, gender, and whole population). MAP benchmark data are used to inform and adjust instructional practice and budget priorities. The SBDM Council also reviews state assessment data (KPREP) and school-level PSAT data. Perceptive survey data, such as TELL is also reviewed by the SBDM Council. Student perceptive data from surveys, such as Olweus are also reviewed. The Council reviews student behavior and attendance data monthly in order to identify barriers to learning and achievement. Principal Paula Stafford serves as SBDM Chair. Teacher members are Jim Gay, Morgan Miller, Tammi Shroul, and Amy Mattingly. Parent members are Jason Toller and Chris Haddix. The SBDM Council meets monthly in regular session and special called sessions as needed. Meeting agendas and minutes document the work of the SBDM Council. McNabb's School Data Planning Team is comprised of Principal Paula Stafford, teachers Caitlin Sadler and Lee Drury and Instructional Coach Nancy Miller. The team meets formally twice per year as part of the district data planning team to determine the scope of work for the entire faculty. Twice annually, the entire faculty convenes to review KPREP data, MAP data, and any other measures to identify priority focus students for RTI as well as Tier I interventions. Meeting agenda and meeting materials document the work of the team and faculty. The Improvement and Planning Committee, a standing SBDM Committee, meets at least quarterly to assist in reviewing data and making recommendations to the SBDM Council for priority work. The committee is composed of teachers and administrators. The members are: Chair Aaron Combs, Morgan Miller, Lee Drury, Stephen Burke, Guidance Counselor Tonia Toy and Principal Paula Stafford. The work of the committee is documented in committee reports to the SBDM Council. Each week, department level PLC groups convene to review and analyze common formative and summative data. The results are used to refine curricula and drive instructional decisions. The PLC groups are guided by Instructional Coaches and administrators.

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:

- Thirty-four (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2017 to 2019, we saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four (54%) of our students scored proficient in math compared to the state average of 57%.

Example of Non-Academic Current State:

- Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance rate was 84% for the 2018-19 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2017-18 to 288 in 2018-19.
- Kentucky TELL Survey results indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

For the 2018-19 school year, according to KPREP, 59.9% of all students scored proficient or distinguished in reading. This is a decline of 3.1% from the previous year. 61.3% of white students scored proficient or distinguished in reading; this is a 2.7% decline from the previous year. 36.2% of Hispanic students scored proficient/distinguished in reading, which is also a decline from the previous year. 17.5% of students with disabilities scored proficient or distinguished in reading. This is an increase of 4.5% from the 2017-18 school year. Free/Reduced meal students had a 50.8% reading proficiency rate; this is a 4.8% decline from the previous year. In math, 43.8% of all students scored proficient/distinguished. This is a substantial decrease from the previous year (51%). White students had a math proficiency rate of 44.6% which represents a 6.4% drop from 2017-18. 31% of Hispanic students scored proficient/distinguished in math compared to 39% the previous year. 4% of students with disabilities scored proficient/distinguished which represents a 2% decline from the previous year. Free/reduced meal students had a math proficiency rate of 33.6% , a decline of 7.4% from 2017-18. McNabb's proficiency rate for science is 28.4% which exceeds the state average by 2.4%. Social studies remains a strong performing area. The proficiency rate for 2018-19 is 79.4%, which exceeds the state average by 20.6%. Although the writing proficiency rate declined, so did the state average. Our writing proficiency rate (41.6%) exceeds the state average by almost 10% (31.90%). McNabb exited TSI status due to growth in the special education population. The Growth indicator was calculated differently for 2018-19 than it was in 2017-18, so it is not possible to compare to the previous year. McNabb's growth index for 2018-19 was 43, which gives it a rating of very low. The growth index for students with disabilities was 42.6. The growth index for students with disabilities is essentially the same as for all students. According to beginning of year MAP data, 52.1% of all students are projected to score proficient/distinguished on reading on Spring 2020 KPREP, and 37.7% are expected to demonstrate proficiency in math. MAP projection for special education indicates 8.8% for reading proficiency and 3.3% for math proficiency. MAP projection for Hispanic students indicates 23.4% proficiency for math and 38.1% for reading. The MAP proficiency projection for white students in math is 39.1% and 52.5% in reading. Non-Academic Data: McNabb, along with the district, has begun an anti-bullying program called Olweus. Numerous reports have documented the negative impact bullying has on student attendance, which in turn affects student achievement. Our students completed a comprehensive survey. Survey results reveal that students identify bullying occurring most frequently in the hallways/stairwells and in the classroom (with both teacher present and out of the room). Of the students who indicated they have been bullied, 42% told their

parent/guardian, 33% told a teacher/adult at school, and 28% told no one. Student attendance rate for the 2018-19 school year declined slightly from the previous year. The rate for 2018-19 was 93.36% and 93.77% in 2017-18. Both years are significantly above the baseline year in 2015-16 when attendance rate was 92.97%. The number of discipline referrals continues to decline. They decreased by 28% from 2015-16 to 2016-17. Discipline referrals again decreased by 21.4% from 2016-17 to 2017-18. The number continued to decline by 20% from 2017-18 to 2018-19 and that was with an additional 400 students in the building.

Priorities/Concerns

Clearly and concisely identify areas of weakness using precise numbers and percentages.

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Continuous Improvement Planning Diagnostic for Schools.

Example: Sixty-eight (68%) of students in the achievement gap scored below proficiency on the KPREP test in reading as opposed to just 12% of non-gap learners.

Special education remains a concern and priority area. Students with disabilities are consistently and significantly scoring below the population as a whole and as compared to any other sub-population. They are the only sub-population with a "significant gap" as identified by the KDE. 17.5% of students with disabilities scored proficient/distinguished in reading as compared to 59.9% of the entire population; thus, 82.5% of students with disabilities fall below proficiency in reading. Four percent (4%) of students with disabilities scored proficient/distinguished in math as compared to 43.8% of all students; thus 96% of students with disabilities score below proficiency. For several years, the math scores of students with disabilities are well below their reading scores. For all students and all sub-populations, our students continue to perform more poorly in math than in reading, which is the case for the entire state.

Trends

Analyzing data trends from the previous two academic years, which academic, cultural and behavioral measures remain significant areas for improvement?

Our trend data for the past three years indicate math scores are weaker than reading scores. Students with disabilities continue to significantly perform lower than any other sub-population and continue to have significant proficiency gaps in both reading and math. Social studies has remained a strength and students are performing well; this is not an area of concern. While writing scores declined this year, the decline is consistent with what happened state-wide. Our writing scores remain well above the state average. The proficiency rate for science is well below the rate for any other content area, but is above the state average. Special education, at all grade levels, remains an area for significant improvement. Special education students significantly underperform all students and all sub groups in both reading and math. Consistent and significant decreases in behavior referrals indicate a need for maintaining current measures to ensure continued success.

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](#)

McNabb will focus on KCWP 5: Design, Align, and Deliver Support. Specifically we will focus on systems to monitor students with disabilities data regularly to ensure students are making continuous improvement in reading and math; align CSIP to ensure resources to support math best practice; system in place to ensure full implementation of Laying the Foundation math lessons and vertical articulation of LTF implementation. Additionally, we will continue to focus on KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction. Specifically, systems of collaboration in order to meet needs of all students, and especially to ensure specially designed instruction is fully in place to meet the needs of students with disabilities.; processes to ensure students understand learning expectations; processes to monitor student learning before, during, and after instruction; and processes to ensure student mastery of content.

Strengths/Leverages

Plainly state, using precise numbers and percentages revealed by current data, the strengths and leverages of the school.

Example: Graduation rate has increased from 67% the last five years to its current rate of 98%.

Student attendance remains a leverage point. The attendance rate has improved from 92.97% in 2015-16 to 93.36% in 2018-19. More students are at school more often and have increased access to learning. 2019-20 is the second year in which students in grades 6-8 are housed at McNabb. Having all three middle school grades in the same building allows for greater articulation of curriculum, vertical planning, and collaboration within and between grade levels. The number of discipline referrals continues to decline. They decreased by 28% from 2015-16 to 2016-17. Discipline referrals again decreased by 21.4% from 2016-17 to 2017-18. The number continued to decline by 20% from 2017-18 to 2018-19 and that was with an additional 400 students in the building. Fewer discipline referrals means students are in class more and have increased access to instruction.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------