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## CAMPUS DEMOGRAPHICS

McLean ISD is a PreK-12, single-campus district with a student population that averages around 210 students. During the 2013-14 school year, $44.1 \%$ of students were classified as economically disadvantaged, and $0.9 \%$ were English Language learners. The mobility rate for 2014-15 was $16.8 \%$. That means that $16.8 \%$ of the students in the district were in membership at McLean ISD for less than $83 \%$ of the school year ( 37 of our students were not enrolled at MISD for at least six weeks). In 2013-14, 20.9\% of students met the criteria for being classified as "at-risk" of dropping out of school.

Ethnic distribution: 86.1\% White, 12.9\% Hispanic, 1.0\% Two or more races

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE

In determining needs for the McLean Independent School District, the Site-Based Decision Making Committee examined student performance on the student achievement indicators as outlined in TEC 39.053c: assessment instruments, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college readiness standards. Data sources include STAAR 3-8/EOC results, state accountability reports, and the ACT College Readiness Letter, and 2014 ACT Profile Report.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS: GRADES 3-8 STAAR, 9-11 EOC

| McLean ISD-2014 STAAR SCORES (All Students - Compared to State Average) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Subject | 2014 Standard |  | 2016 Standard? |  | Final Standard (2017? 2018?) |  | Advanced |  |
|  |  | McLEAN | State | McLEAN | State | McLEAN | State | McLEAN | State |
| 3 | Reading | 89 | 76 | 63 | 59 | 58 | 42 | 5 | 17 |
| 3 | Math | 67 | 70 | 44 | 52 | 39 | 33 | 17 | 16 |
| 4 | Reading | 100 | 74 | 67 | 55 | 25 | 36 | 8 | 18 |
| 4 | Math | 100 | 70 | 67 | 56 | 17 | 37 | 8 | 20 |
| 4 | Writing | 100 | 73 | 75 | 53 | 58 | 36 | 0 | 27 |
| 5 | Reading | 90 | 76 | 70 | 62 | 50 | 43 | 10 | 24 |
| 5 | Math | 80 | 79 | 50 | 63 | 20 | 43 | 10 | 22 |
| 5 | Science | 73 | 73 | 18 | 54 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 11 |
| 6 | Reading | 91 | 77 | 73 | 59 | 36 | 40 | 9 | 23 |
| 6 | Math | 100 | 79 | 91 | 58 | 82 | 39 | 36 | 17 |
| 7 | Reading | 100 | 75 | 85 | 57 | 55 | 39 | 5 | 19 |
| 7 | Math | 90 | 67 | 80 | 49 | 55 | 31 | 10 | 33 |
| 7 | Writing | 85 | 70 | 65 | 50 | 30 | 30 | 15 | 20 |
| 8 | Reading | 100 | 82 | 74 | 64 | 53 | 47 | 0 | 18 |
| 8 | Math | 79 | 79 | 53 | 59 | 37 | 38 | 0 | 8 |
| 8 | Science | 58 | 71 | 53 | 56 | 37 | 40 | 5 | 20 |
| 8 | Social Studies | 47 | 62 | 32 | 44 | 16 | 27 | 0 | 14 |
| 9 | Eng I EOC | 88 | 62 | 81 | 47 | 69 | 40 | 0 | 6 |
| 9 | Algebra I | 100 | 81 | 93 | 60 | 71 | 39 | 29 | 18 |
| 10 | Eng II EOC | 91 | 66 | 58 | 54 | 33 | 45 | 0 | 6 |
| 11 | US History | 100 | 92 | 71 | 76 | 57 | 51 | 21 | 16 |

As they relate to 2014 standards, analysis of scores from "All Students" reveals the following:

- Percentages of MISD students passing (scoring at least Level II: Satisfactory) in 18 of 21 subject/grade areas equaled or exceeded the state percentages of students who achieved passing scores in corresponding subjects/grade area.
- Grade 3 Math and grade 8 science and social studies percentages of students who scored at passing or above fell below that of the state average.
- Percentages of MISD student achieving a score of "Advanced" or higher were LOWER than the state percentages of students achieving an "Advanced" score in 17 of 21 subject/grade test areas.
- Higher than state percentages of students earning a score of "Advanced" or higher were achieved by MISD students in grade 3 math, grade 6 math, Algebra I, and US History.

According to the Texas Education Agency 2014 Accountability Summary (Appendix - page 1), McLean ISD received a "Met Standard" rating for the campus and district by exceeding all the cut off scores for Indices 1, 3, and 4. PreK-12 campuses were not evaluated on Index 2 for the 2013-14 school year.

The 2014 TAPR Index 1: Student Achievement Data Table for McLean ISD percentages appear below:

| Percentage of Students Meeting 2014 Passing Standard (Level II) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * less than students; <br> \# masked forpivacy | All Students | Hispanic | White | SpecEd | Econ Dis |
| ALL SUBJECTS | $86 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $81 \%$ |
| Grades 3-11 | $271 / 315$ | $31 / 35$ | $238 / 278$ | $20 / 25$ | $109 / 135$ |
| Reading | $93 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Grades 3-10 | $113 / 122$ | $13 / 14$ | $99 / 107$ | $8 / 10$ | $45 / 50$ |
| Mathematics | $88 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| Grades 3-9 | $87 / 99$ | $8 / 10$ | $78 / 88$ | $7 / 9$ | $33 / 41$ |
| Writing | $91 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| Grades 4, 7, 9, 10 | $29 / 32$ | $*$ | $26 / 29$ | $*$ | $9 / 11$ |
| Science | $66 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
| Grades 5, 8 | $19 / 29$ | $*$ | $16 / 25$ | $*$ | $10 / 16$ |
| Social Studies | $70 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| Grades 8, 11 | $23 / 33$ | $*$ | $19 / 29$ | $*$ | $12 / 17$ |
| SYSTEM SAFEGUARD NOTES: |  |  |  |  |  |
| STATE: Minimum \# tests must equal 25; all subjects are eligible (Yellow highlighted cells) |  |  |  |  |  |
| FEDERAL: Minimum \# of tests must equal 25; reading/math only (Yellow cells + red text) |  |  |  |  |  |
| STATE STANDARD: 55\% | FEDERAL STANDARD: 79\% |  |  |  |  |

## System Safeguards - formerly Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Because of a waiver granted by the USDOE, Adequate Yearly Progress has been replaced by a System Safeguard system. McLean ISD met 100\% of system safeguards both at the state and federal standards. (See explanation and data in table above.) In addition to performance standards, districts must also meet 95\% participation standards and 80\% graduation standards. In 2012-13, McLean ISD failed to meet the state system safeguard in writing for economically disadvantaged students. Performance on that indicator has been improved significantly.

## TAPR - Index 2: STUDENT PROGRESS

Because high schools and K -12 districts had a limited amount of progress data on which to measure this indicator, McLean ISD was not evaluated on student progress in 2014. We will, however, be measured using this standard in 2014-15. This index examines the amount of growth that each student makes from his performance on the previous year's reading and math tests to the current year's test. If a student makes an amount of growth that is expected, the district receives 1 point. If the student exceeds his expected growth, the district receives 2 points. Even though the district was not formally evaluated on this index, it is important to consider the data.

READING: In the spring of 2014, only 70 students had test data available in reading for comparison with the previous year's scores. Of those 70 students, 33 (47\%) met or exceeded expected progress for the year. Seven students (10\%) exceeded their expected progress for the year.

MATH: Seventy-eight students had test data available for progress measurement in math. 46 students (59\%) met or exceeded expected growth for the year. Ten students (13\%) exceeded expected growth.

Since standards were not set for K-12 districts, it is difficult to project what impact these percentages would have had on the accountability status for McLean ISD. However, meeting expected student growth at a higher rate is identified need for teachers and students at McLean ISD.

Index 3 of the Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) reports a district's performance in closing performance gaps for economically disadvantaged students and other subpopulations. As indicated in the performance table above, performance for economically disadvantaged students is somewhat lower when compared to white or Hispanic students. However, these scores are an improvement from the previous year and represent a closing of the much larger gap that did exist, primarily in writing.

TAPR Index 3 also examines the number of economically disadvantaged students who are performing at the advanced level. Out of 135 tests taken by economically disadvantaged students, only 6 students scored at the advanced level (4.45\%). This index compares EcoDis advantaged performance with the next two largest subpopulations that meet size criteria. Since McLean ISD does not have two subpopulations that meet the size criteria, economically disadvantaged scores are considered alone. For purposes of this needs assessment, we compared economically disadvantaged student performance with performance of all students. The percentages vary just over one point: of the number of tests taken by all students (457), 26 students scored at the advanced level ( $5.69 \%$ ). As pointed out in a previous paragraph, the concern is that students (all students) are not performing at the advanced level at as high a rate as would be desired and expected.

## DROPOUT RATE/ GRADUATION RATE

The most recent dropout data available from 2013 TAPR Four-Year Longitudinal Summary Report based on the class of 2013 indicates a graduation rate of $92.9 \%$ and a dropout rate of $7.1 \%$. While McLean ISD strives for a goal of having no student drop out, the graduation rate meets the federal four-year graduation rate standard of $80 \%$.

## COLLEGE READINESS STANDARDS

## TAPR (2014 Texas Academic Performance Report)

Index 4 of the new accountability system addresses post-secondary readiness. According to data tables for the 2014 TAPR which has not yet been released, $50 \%$ ( 6 of 12) of the class of 2013 met college readiness standards in both ELA and Math. Six students met ELA standards while eight students met math standards. The relatively low rate of 2013 RHSP/DAP graduates will also affect the district's post-secondary readiness index score in the 2014 TAPR. Data for the class of 2014 will be included in the 2015 TAPR and should result in higher Index 4 performance for the district in terms of readiness standards, types of diploma, and graduation rates.

## ACT/SAT Results

ACT has established college readiness indicators based on ACT results. Benchmarks are set for each subject area to serve as predictors of college success in corresponding subjects. Benchmarks are as follows: English Composition - 18 on English subtest; Algebra - 22 on Math subtest; Social Science - 21 on ACT Reading subtest; and Biology - 24 on ACT Science subtest. Data for the class of 2014 is available in this report. A comparison of McLean student performance and benchmarks indicate that 71\% demonstrate readiness for English Composition; 43\% demonstrate readiness for College Algebra; 43\% demonstrate readiness for Reading; and 7\% demonstrate readiness for Science/Biology. Seven percent of students met benchmarks in all four areas. Percentages in ELA, College Algebra, and Reading are higher than state and national averages, while the Science and all tests percentages fall below state and national averages. Additionally, average ACT scores fell in all areas, following below state average in every area: English 18.8 (19.8); Math 20.1 (21.4); Reading 19.9 (21.1); Science 19.6 (21.0); and Composite 19.6 (20.9). State averages are listed in parentheses beside the MISD average.

The drop in college readiness percentages and average scores can be attributed to the fact that a larger percentage of students from the class of 2014 participated in the ACT assessment (14 of 14) than did the class of 2013 (7 of 12). Index 4 of the state accountability system recognizes participation in ACT. It is always preferable for a large percentage of students to participate in the assessment rather than for scores to be skewed higher based on a smaller representative sample.

## TELL TEXAS TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

In response to the mandate of the $83^{\text {rd }}$ Legislature (HB 2012), the Commissioner of Education and the TEA created the TELL (Teaching, Empowering, Leading, Learning) Survey in order to determine if educators have the supports necessary for effective teaching. Districts were directed to provide teachers with an anonymous access code so that teachers could go online from any computer with an internet connection to submit their survey. Teachers were not identified by name, but they were identified by district. The survey was conducted during the spring of 2014. A report of district participation rates as well as reports of teacher responses for districts who had at least $50 \%$ of their teachers (and at least a minimum of 20 teachers) complete the survey. $19.54 \%$ of teachers in the state responded to the survey, and 70 districts (about 16\%) had enough teachers respond to generate reports. McLean ISD had the $8^{\text {th }}$ highest response rate in the state at $89.66 \%$, which was also the highest response rate of all Region 16 schools.

Since that stated main intent of the TELL Survey was to provide additional data for school and district improvement, a discussion of identified needs is included in this Comprehensive Needs Assessment. On the whole, MISD responses reflected a higher agreement and/or satisfaction rate than the state average on statements concerning district resources, personnel, instructional practices and support with the following exceptions:
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { The curriculum taught at this school is aligned with the TEKS. } & \frac{96.8}{96.2} & \quad 9\end{array}$
Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.
Provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching, professional learning communities, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.
Teachers believe that almost every student has the potential to do well on assignments.
Teachers collaborate to achieve consistency on how student work is assessed.
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Teachers know what students learn in each of their classes. } & 79.0 & 65.4\end{array}$
Teachers have knowledge of the content covered and instructional methods
$77.6 \quad 76.0$
used by other teachers.
Teachers use district assessment data to inform their instruction. $92.9 \quad 91.3$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Teachers use school/teacher assessment data to inform their instruction. } & 94.5 & 90.9\end{array}$
A large section of the survey covered professional development needs of the district.
Respondents were asked the following question: In which of the following areas (if any) do you need professional development to teacher your students more effectively? The McLean ISD results are summarized below with state response percentages indicated in parentheses.

## Professional Development Area

YES (more needed) NO
Your content area
Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)
Student assessment
Differentiating instruction
Special Education (students with disabilities)
Special Education (gifted and talented)
English Language Learners (ELL-ESL)
Closing the Achievement Gap
Methods of teaching
Reading strategies
Integrating technology into instruction
Classroom management techniques

| YES (more needed) | NO |
| :---: | :---: |
| $68 \%(49 \%)$ | $32 \%(51 \%)$ |
| $55 \%(38 \%)$ | $45 \%(62 \%)$ |
| $41 \%(37 \%)$ | $59 \%(63 \%)$ |
| $82 \%(60 \%)$ | $18 \%(40 \%)$ |
| $64 \%(56 \%)$ | $36 \%(44 \%)$ |
| $55 \%(49 \%)$ | $45 \%(51 \%)$ |
| $27 \%(49 \%)$ | $72 \%(51 \%)$ |
| $43 \%(62 \%)$ | $57 \%(38 \%)$ |
| $50 \%(46 \%)$ | $50 \%(54 \%)$ |
| $24 \%(47 \%)$ | $76 \%(53 \%)$ |
| $77 \%(64 \%)$ | $23 \%(36 \%)$ |
| $32 \%(37 \%)$ | $68 \%(63 \%)$ |

Knowledge of the TEKS and content for each class as well as vertical alignment within subject areas are all identified as needs of the district. Identifying consistent ways of assessing students so that teachers will know how students are doing in their classes is also a critical need. Professional development needs should be a consideration of the campus/district committee during the 2014-15 school year for implementation during the summer of 2015 and beyond.

## BEYOND 2014-2015

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The Texas Education Agency has recently announced that passing standards for 2014-15 will remain the same as for 2012-13 and 2013-14. However, there will be a significant jump in student performance expectation for the 2015-16 school year. Considering data that was provided with the 2014 test results, the following preliminary projections could be made based on student performance on the 2014 STAAR test:

Index 1: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT (2016 and 2017 standard)

| \# at phase-in 2 standard |  |  |  | = 2016 \& 2017 standard |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| total tests taken |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | Math | Writing | Science | $\begin{gathered} \text { Social St } \\ 16 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ELA | 208 | 65 <br> index <br> score |
| 66 | 73 | 21 | 12 |  | 20 |  |  |
| 91 | 105 | 32 | 30 | 33 | 28 | 319 |  |

It is important to remember that this projection is based on the TEKS and tests that were administered in the spring of 2014. The "passing" standard for index 1 in 2014 was 55 which indicates that the district would achieve an acceptable score on Index 1. With a legislative session about to occur in the spring of 2015 and with shifting standards from year to year, this projection should be considered with the knowledge that it reflects the information that is available at the time of this writing. It is always subject to change.

SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS - Meeting the state system safeguard standard would be problematic, particularly in $5^{\text {th }}$ grade science and $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade math. With the adoption of new math and science textbooks that are aligned to new TEKS, weaknesses have been identified in scope/sequence and rigor of early elementary math and science programs. Without significant changes, meeting federal system safeguards of $80 \%+$ will be extremely challenging.

SETTING FUTURE GOALS - It is important for the district to remember that meeting Index 1 addresses only the overall "passing" standard for the "all students" group. Indices 2, 3, and 4 focus attention on subpopulations as well as on the higher standards of Final Recommended Level 2 and Advanced performance. The readiness of our high school students to move on to the next phase in their educational or vocational process is measured in Index 4. Striving for "enough" students to "pass the test" has never been a worthy goal. The new accountability system forces districts to look beyond that minimum standard and examine student performance at all grade levels, in all subject areas, and for all students as individuals.

