



2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for
Schools_09082020_17:42

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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

Table of Contents

2020-21 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

2020-21 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, 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 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 Impact Kentucky Working Conditions survey 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 Brandy Holley serves as SBDM Chair. Teacher members are Dustin Bowen, Brandi Caudill, Marybeth Christman, and Amy Mattingly. Parent members are Jamie Allison, Justin Cockrell, and Jackie Evans. 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 Brandy Holley, 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. 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 percent (34%) of students in the achievement gap scored proficient on KPREP Reading.
- From 2018 to 2020, the school saw an 11% increase in novice scores in reading among students in the achievement gap.
- Fifty-four percent (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 2019-20 school year – a decrease from 92% in 2017-18.
- The number of behavior referrals increased from 204 in 2018-19 to 288 in 2019-20.
- Survey results and perception data indicated 62% of the school's teachers received adequate professional development.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we do not have state assessment scores for the 2019-2020 school year. The data that will be used will be the 2018-2019 state assessment scores. The most recent data available is from the 2018-2019 school year. 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 the beginning of year MAP data, 52.1% of all students are projected to score proficient/distinguished on reading on Spring 2019 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: The student attendance rate for the 2019-2020 school year increased slightly from the previous year. The rate for 2019-2020 was 93.91% and was 93.36% for 2018-19. Both years are significantly above the baseline year in 2015-16 when the attendance rate was 92.97%. The Impact Kentucky Working Conditions survey was given during the 2019-2020 school year. The school climate received a 31% favorable rating. School leadership saw a favorable rating of 36%. Managing student behavior was 42% favorable among the staff, and Resources available to teachers was rated at 29%. Educating all students had a favorable rating of 70%. Students completed a survey on the safety and overall school environment in 2019-2020. 'My school is a caring place' saw 70.3% of students agree or strongly agree with that statement. 'I feel like I belong at my school' scored 74.7% agree or strongly agree. The number of discipline referrals continues to decline. They decreased by 29.5% from 2015-16 to 2016-17. Discipline referrals again decreased by 31.31% from 2016-17 to 2017-18. The number continued to decline by 16% from 2017-18 to 2018-19 and that was with an additional 400 students in the building. The 2019-2020 data saw a decrease again, this time of 10% when compared to the 2018-2019 school year. 'I feel safe at my school' scored 68.8% agree and strongly agree.

Priorities/Concerns

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

NOTE: These priorities will be thoroughly addressed in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) diagnostic and template.

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.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we do not have state assessment scores for the 2019-2020 school year. The data that will be used will be the 2018-2019 state assessment scores. 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 during the last KPREP test that was given. 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. Additionally, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, students have not received as much typical in class instruction as they have in other years. All students are going to require support to ensure that gaps do not develop and that students are supported and successful.

Trends

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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we do not have state assessment scores for the 2019-2020 school year. The data that will be used will be the 2018-2019 state assessment scores. 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 subgroups 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 the 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 93.91% in 2019-20. More students are at school more often and have increased access to learning. 2020-21 is the third 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 29.5% from 2015-16 to 2016-17. Discipline referrals again decreased by 31.31% from 2016-17 to 2017-18. The number continued to decline by 16% from 2017-18 to 2018-19 and that was with an additional 400 students in the building. The 2019-2020 data saw a decrease again, this time of 10% when compared to the 2018-2019 school year.

Attachment Summary

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