

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools_10222020_11:37

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

Muhlenberg South Middle School

Brian Lile
200 Pritchett Dr
Greenville, Kentucky, 42345
United States of America

Target Completion Date: 11/01/2020

Last Modified: 10/26/2020

Status: Locked

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	7
Trends	8
Potential Source of Problem.....	9
Strengths/Leverages	10
Attachment Summary	11

2020-21 Phase Two: The Needs Assessment for Schools

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?

Data is analyzed throughout the school year in many different ways. Teachers are constantly evaluating and analyzing student data; teachers give quizzes, chapter tests, unit tests, and pre-tests to assess student learning progress. Students are typically given the MAP test three times during the school year; however, last year that last MAP test was taken in the winter. Teachers analyze MAP scores to see which students are proficient, which are struggling and in which areas the students are having difficulties. Teachers meet as grade level and content area teams to review and analyze data. Special education teachers analyze data and progress for individual students on a weekly basis. In addition, those students receiving interventions are assessed weekly and that data is evaluated by a team of teachers, the counselor, and a district representative when available. Depending on the student and/or situation, the data is recorded in meeting notes and/or other records and occur weekly, monthly or annually. The data is applied in various ways including but not limited to teacher instruction, interventions, and the student being referred for additional tutoring services.

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.

62.9% of students in the scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Reading and 55.4% of students scored proficient or distinguished on KPREP Math. In 2019, economically disadvantaged students consistently scored lower than students who are not economically disadvantaged. This is true for the areas of reading and math. Likewise, students with an IEP scored considerably lower in both areas than students who did not have an IEP. The number of behavior events has decreased from 200 events involving only 119 students in 2018-19 to 143 incidents involving 76 different students. Also, teacher and student attendance continues to improve; student attendance was 93.5% for the 2018-2019 school year. Data for the 2019-2020 school year is misleading due to the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures in March.

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.

49.2% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or distinguished on the KPREP reading assessment compared to 80.8% of students who are not economically disadvantaged. Similarly in math, 41.4% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or distinguished while 73.9% of students who are not economically disadvantaged scored proficient or distinguished. MSMS is 58.1% ED; that a total of 266 students based on last year's information. Out school, YSC, and community organizations, including churches, are trying to meet the basic needs of families and students.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

 [FRYSC Assist Numbers for 2019-2020](#)

Trends

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

Since the on-demand writing component has moved to the 8th grade, writing scores have consistently dropped. Students in consolidated students group, specifically students with disabilities, score significantly lower on the KPREP reading and math than other students. The percentage of students at MSMS with a disability and an IEP as well as students who are economically disadvantaged continues to rise; these students score consistently lower on their MAP tests and KPREP assessments.

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](#)

Although the school and community agencies continue to support students and families in a variety of ways including food, clothing, shelter and counseling services, the majority of students at MSMS qualify for free/reduced food program. 102 students received assistance last year for Christmas. 41 families received additional vouchers or food bags from the YSC. 7 families had one or more bills paid for by the YSC. 78 students received a new pair of shoes. When basic needs are not being met, students struggle to learn.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment Name

 [FRYSC Assist Numbers for 2019-2020](#)

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%.

The number of behavior incidents has decreased from 200 in 2018-19 to 143 in 2019-2020; incidents involved only 76 students or 15.7% of the student body. Teacher attendance continues to improve; in 2018-19 teachers had missed 150 days by mid-March. In 2019-2020, teachers had only missed 119 by March 13th. In addition, scores show that students at MSMS continue to perform well overall in math on the KPREP.

Attachment Summary

Attachment Name	Description	Associated Item(s)
 FRYSC Assist Numbers for 2019-2020		: