

Title 1 School-Wide Plan

Washington School

Pana, IL

2016 - 2017

**2016-17**  
**Title I School-wide Plan**  
***Washington Elementary School***  
**Pana, IL**

*School District Name:* Pana C.U.S.D. #8  
*School District Address:* 14 E. Main P.O. Box 377  
Pana, Illinois 62557

*District Superintendent:* Dr. David Lett  
*Phone:* 217.562.1500 *Fax:* 217.562.1501  
*Email Address:* [dlett@panaschools.com](mailto:dlett@panaschools.com)

*Title I Coordinator:* Cheri Wysong  
*Phone:* 217.562-7500 *Fax:* 217.562.9262  
*Email Address:* [cwysong@panaschools.com](mailto:cwysong@panaschools.com)

*School Name:* Washington Elementary School  
*School Address:* 200 S. Sherman.  
Pana, IL 62557

*Principal:* Cheri Wysong  
*Phone:* 217.562.7500 *Fax:* 217.562.9262

Washington Elementary is a Pre-K – 2 school which served approximately 314 students during the 2015-2016 school year. Washington Elementary is located in the southeastern portion of Christian County, Illinois. Washington School is one of 2 elementary schools in the Pana C.U.S.D. #8 district. The district also includes 1 Jr. High school, and 1 high school. Based on the 2016-2017 fall housing report Pana C.U.S.D. #8 has a school population of approximately 1,322 students and a community population of 6000 thousand people. Demographically, the city of Pana is challenged economically with many families living below the poverty index. Currently 71% of the students at Washington Elementary qualify for free and reduced lunch, and 65% of the students within the district. This compares to 50 % of free and reduced students for the state. Ethnically, the district is approximately 96% white compared to 49% for the state.

**Section 1: Evaluation Team**

<b><i>Individual Names</i></b>	<b><i>Evaluation Team Representative Group</i></b>	<b><i>Role / Responsibilities</i></b>
<i>Cheri Wysong</i>	Principal Title One Director	Administrator
<i>Rebecca Mahnke</i>	Reading Intervention Teacher	Licensed Staff
<i>Cindy Denning</i>	Math Intervention Teacher	Licensed Staff
<i>Jody Hay</i>	PE Teacher	Licensed Staff
<i>Erica LaMarche</i>	Kindergarten Teacher	Licensed Staff
<i>Lindsey Kerby</i>	First Grade Teacher	Licensed Staff
<i>Jenny Lehn</i>	Second Grade Teacher	Licensed Staff
<i>Candy Byars</i>	Special Education Teacher	Mid State Staff
<i>Jessica Miller</i>	Technology Integration Specialist	Licensed Staff
<i>Whitney Reynolds</i>	PBIS Coordinator	Licensed Staff
<i>Wendy Mundell</i>	Data Resource	District Staff
<i>Jessica Niehart</i>	Parent of Washington Student	Community Member

***Meeting Dates and Agenda Items***

<i>Date/Time</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Agenda Topics</i>	<i>Attendees</i>
Sept. 12, 2016	Title One Reading Room	Discussed the Evaluation schedule, Leadership Team Members, Meeting Dates, and Parent Compact.	R. Mahnke, L. Kerby, J. Lehn, J. Niehart & C. Byars
October 3, 2016	Title One Reading Room	Reviewed the Title One School-Wide Evaluation from last year and discussed PBIS an Lumens Data Analysis Process an Goals	R. Mahnke, C. Denning, C. Byars & J. Hay
October 6, 2016	Title One Reading Room	Discussed previous meeting and added information and made changes to the Evaluation Document for the 2015-16.	R. Mahnke, C. Dennint & C. Byars
October 12, 2016	Title One Reading Room	Discussed & Worked on updating the Title One Evaluation	R. Mahnke & C. Denning
November 7, 2016	Title One Reading Room	Discussed & Worked on the Title One Plan. Specifically Goals and MAP data.	R. Mahnke, C. Denning, J. Hay, C. Byars, J. Lehn, E. LaMarche, L. Kerby & J. Niehart
November 9, 2016	Title One Reading Room	Added information (Goals & MAP Data) discussed at the Nov. 7 Meeting to the Plan.	R. Mahnke

## Components of a School-wide Plan

### Section 1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment

As the first step to developing a Title I School-wide Plan for Washington Elementary School, the team conducted an evaluation of the 2015-2016 School-Wide Plan. In completing the evaluation, the team examined the following key areas: student demographics, student achievement, curriculum and instruction, community and parent involvement, highly qualified professional staff, and school context and organization. The data results of this review and evaluation were used to guide the current plan.

#### *Student Demographic Data*

The graph below contains trend information for the past three years regarding our percentage of students from families qualifying for the free and reduced lunch program, our attendance rate, the mobility rate of our students, the percentage of students with an IEP, school population, and a comparison of race and ethnicity.

Year	Low Income	Attendance Rate (%)	Mobility (%)	IEP (%)	School Population	White Non-Hispanci	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	American Indian	Multiracial
2016	71.7	95.3	14.8	12.1	314	96.5	1.3	1	0	1.3
2015	75.2	94.4	11.4	12.5	323	95.9	1.2	0.9	0	1.5
2014	68.6	95.1	14.3	12.4	258	95.1	.8	1.2	0	2.7
2013	70.7	94.3	11.7	11.6	249	96.4	0.4	0.8	0.4	1.6
Avg.	71.5	94.7	13.0	12.1	286	95.9	0.9	0.975	0.1	1.77

- 2013 Shows "students with disabilities" as the new category title.

As illustrated in the chart above only a small percentage of students are minorities with a four year average of 96% of the students being white. However, on average, almost three quarters, 71.5% of our students come from low income homes and trend data shows that this continues to increase yearly. In addition on average, 12.1% of our students have an IEP.

Similar to the students' demographics, the staff is 100% white. At the present time, Washington Elementary School does not have a large ethnic population. This results in our students having very little experience with diversity. However, trend data does suggest a slight increase in the number of minority students.

## Student Achievement

Kindergarten students at Washington School are assessed throughout the year using a wide variety of teacher developed Common Formative Assessments, Student Learner Objectives and curriculum based assessments. 1st Grade students are routinely assessed in the reading curriculum using teacher developed tests based in part on the Houghton Mifflin Reading series as well as Common Formative Assessments and Student Learner Objectives. Second Grade students are routinely assessed in the reading curriculum using teacher developed tests based in part on the McMillian-McGraw Hill Reading series as well as Common Formative Assessments and Student Learner Objectives.

As part of the Tiered Level Intervention program at Washington School, struggling students are progress monitored weekly/bi-weekly depending on their needs. Individual and small group needs are determined and targeted interventions are given 30-45 minutes daily in addition to the core curriculum. All Reading and Math curriculum and interventions used at Washington School are research based.

All K-2 students are also routinely monitored using AIMSWeb. All students are benchmarked three times a year (October, January, and May) by the Data Sweep Team. The team includes the Title I teachers, School Psychologist, Mid-State Employees and Paraprofessionals. All information is gathered by the team and data is input into the AIMSWeb program. The following tables provide a summary of the data collected during the last 3 years. In Addition this year we will begin the transition to MAP testing which will replace AIMSWeb next year. A sample table for MAP Reading is provided below the tables showing the AIMSWeb data.

AIMSWeb Reading Data Kindergarten		2013-2014 Kindergarten Composite Scores			2014-2015 Kindergarten Composite Scores			2015-2016 Kindergarten Composite Scores		
		F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Letter Naming Fluency	Tier 1	75%	85%	79%	79%	76%	85%	72%	81%	85%
	Tier 2	20%	9%	18%	18%	22%	13%	18%	10%	9%
	Tier 3	5%	6%	3%	3%	2%	2%	10%	10%	7%
Letter Sound Fluency	Tier 1	-	76%	84%	-	72%	88%	-	84%	88%
	Tier 2	-	19%	16%	-	22%	10%	-	10%	4%
	Tier 3	-	5%	0%	-	7%	2%	-	7%	8%
Phonemic Segmentation	Tier 1	-	85%	84%	-	81%	94%	-	81%	91%
	Tier 2	-	8%	15%	-	9%	5%	-	9%	5%
	Tier 3	-	6%	1%	-	11%	1%	-	8%	3%
Nonsense Word Fluency	Tier 1	-	76%	80%	-	67%	90%	-	82%	88%
	Tier 2	-	18%	18%	-	25%	7%	-	10%	3%
	Tier 3	-	6%	2%	-	8%	3%	-	9%	9%

AIMSWeb Reading Data First Grade		2013-2014 1st Grade Composite Scores			2014-2015 1st Grade Composite Scores			2015-2016 1st Grade Composite Scores		
		F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Letter Naming Fluency	Tier 1	83%	-	-	84%	-	-	79%	-	-
	Tier 2	13%	-	-	12%	-	-	13%	-	-
	Tier 3	5%	-	-	4%	-	-	8%	-	-
Letter Sound Fluency	Tier 1	95%	-	-	96%	-	-	85%	-	-
	Tier 2	5%	-	-	2%	-	-	12%	-	-
	Tier 3	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	3%	-	-
Phonemic Segmentation Fluency	Tier 1	94%	93%	-	94%	88%	-	91%	92%	-
	Tier 2	5%	6%	-	5%	10%	-	7%	5%	-
	Tier 3	1%	1%	-	1%	2%	-	2%	4%	-
Nonsense Word Fluency	Tier 1	89%	76%	83%	86%	85%	86%	80%	86%	86%
	Tier 2	7%	15%	10%	11%	12%	8%	12%	11%	11%
	Tier 3	4%	9%	7%	3%	3%	6%	8%	4%	4%
RCBM	Tier 1	73%	76%	84%	72%	75%	81%	74%	85%	92%
	Tier 2	19%	13%	9%	23%	15%	15%	21%	9%	6%
	Tier 3	8%	10%	7%	4%	11%	4%	6%	6%	2%
MAZE	Tier 1	-	70%	82%	-	75%	89%	-	74%	94%
	Tier 2	-	21%	11%	-	15%	6%	-	21%	4%
	Tier 3	-	10%	7%	-	11%	5%	-	6%	2%

AIMSWeb Reading Data 2nd Grade		2013-2014 2nd Grade Composite Scores			2014-2015 2nd Grade Composite Scores			2015-2016 2nd Grade Composite Scores		
		F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
RCBM	Tier 1	76%	73%	75%	77%	71%	78%	79%	82%	80%
	Tier 2	17%	22%	16%	15%	22%	16%	17%	11%	12%
	Tier 3	7%	5%	9%	8%	7%	6%	4%	8%	9%
MAZE	Tier 1	81%	85%	82%	93%	86%	87%	88%	90%	85%
	Tier 2	11%	12%	10%	5%	5%	6%	9%	7%	9%
	Tier 3	8%	3%	7%	2%	8%	6%	3%	3%	6%

A review of the data from the 2016-16 school year, as compared to previous years shows that the majority of students are performing at grade level in most areas of reading. In Kindergarten the data shows that we are at 85% of students meeting or exceeding our goal in all areas. Letter Naming (85 up 6), Letter Sounds (88 up 4), Phonemic Segmentation (91 up 7%) and Nonsense Words (88 up 8%) Overall this was an excellent performance.

In first grade the data shows that 79% of our students were meeting or exceeding the goal: letter naming (79% down 5%), Letter Sounds (85% down 11%) and Phonemic Segmentation (92% down 1), Nonsense Word Fluency (86% up 3%), Reading (92% up 11%) and Comprehension (94% up 12%). While the scores in Letter Naming and Letter Sounds were down, it should be noted that we do not test these areas again after the fall benchmark. It should also be noted that while scores were up in both reading and comprehension we continue to struggle throughout the year to get our students to this level. In past years we have struggled in both of these areas to get above the 80% mark, and will continue to make this a focus going forward.

The data for second grade for 2013-2014 came from another school within our district, and though not shown on this table, it was noted that scores for the past several years did not make it above 75%. It is unclear what goals were established for the remediation of this issue. Current trend data shows that in Reading Fluency scores have continued to increase from 75% to 80% over those three years. With regard to comprehension, the growth remained steady between 82% and 87%. This data will certainly be used as a starting point going forth. After establishing a goal of 80% for the last 2 years in both Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension the trend data does indicate that scores did increase with the interventions provided. Reading Fluency was (80 up 5%) and Comprehension was (85 up 3%)

Although it would be expected that the percentage of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 would decrease as the year progresses, it should be noted that the goal increases at each testing, making the standard more difficult to reach. Students move between the tiers as their individual needs dictate and are given interventions based on the progress monitoring done weekly / bi-weekly.

*The Assessment results in reading indicate the following areas of concern:*

- Though the students are making progress, in Tier 2 and Tier 3 some students are not making gains quickly enough to meet the ever increasing goals in Reading. In addition the NT (Not Tested) status for letter naming and letter sounds in Grade 1, winter and spring does not allow ongoing comparison for the Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
- 22% of the Grade 2 students continue to struggle with reading and comprehension as indicated by MAZE and RCBM scores.
- The Reading Fluency scores for 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade are no longer well below those of our 1<sup>st</sup> grade students, and the factors influencing this need to be discussed, and appropriate goals set to insure that this trend continues.



The following is a sample of the MAP Pilot Program data that was collected this fall for comparison purposes. Tier 1 students would be those that score at or above the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile compared to AIMS in which Tier 1 students are those that score at or above the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile. Tier 2 students in MAP would be those that score between the 21<sup>st</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> percentiles, while AIMS Tier 2 students score between the 10<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> percentile and MAP students falling in the Tier 3 category would be those students that score at <the 21<sup>st</sup> percentile, while in AIMS it would be those that score below the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile. As we transition to this program, it will be important to note those differences in breakdowns.

In addition the Skill Groups tested by the MAP program differ slightly from the AIMSWeb program. The majority of the areas tested by the AIMSWeb program fall under the Foundational Skills bracket. When you look at a side by side comparison, of last year's fall kindergarten scores as compared to this year's MAP scores and take into account the slight differences in the Tier identification, the testing results do appear to be quite similar.

This testing also provides data on several other aspects of reading that the AIMSWeb program did not, and it is for these reasons that the district has decided to switch testing programs. More information on this will be available throughout the course of this year and next.

Kindergarten MAP Reading Data By Skill Group					Fall 2015 AIMSWeb			Fall 2016 MAP		
		F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Literature & Information	Tier 1							88%		
	Tier 2							10%		
	Tier 3							2%		
Vocabulary Use and Function	Tier 1							87%		
	Tier 2							7%		
	Tier 3							4%		
Language & Writing	Tier 1							57%		
	Tier 2							33%		
	Tier 3							10%		
<b>Foundational Skills</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>				<b>72</b>			<b>61%</b>		
	<b>Tier 2</b>				<b>18</b>			<b>22%</b>		
	<b>Tier 3</b>				<b>10</b>			<b>16%</b>		
Overall Performance	Tier 1							84%		
	Tier 2							12%		
	Tier 3							4%		

For the 2015-16 school years all K-2 students participated in My Math as their core Math curriculum. My Math is a research based math curriculum. Like the reading program, all students are benchmarked three times a year (October, January, and May) by the same Data Sweep Team. Information is gathered by the team and data is input by the Title I Math teacher. 2013-2016 Math data is outlined below.

AIMSWeb Math Data Kindergarten		2013-2014 Kindergarten Composite Scores			2014-2015 Kindergarten Composite Scores			2015-2016 Kindergarten Composite Scores		
		F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Oral Counting Fluency	Tier 1	64	70	83	73.6%	70.7%	86.2%	63.4%	72.1	80.8
	Tier 2	18	21	10	14.3%	23.9%	5.7%	20.8%	19.4	9.6
	Tier 3	18	10	8	12.1%	5.4%	8.0%	15.8%	8.6	9.6
Number Identification	Tier 1	72	79	80	75.8%	79.3%	81.6%	72.3%	82.8	85.1
	Tier 2	17	13	13	18.7%	13.0%	14.9%	11.9%	10.8	6.4
	Tier 3	11	9	7	5.5%	7.6%	3.4%	15.8%	6.5	8.5
Quantity Discrimination	Tier 1	NT	82	84	NT	76.1%	80.5%	--	88.2	81.9
	Tier 2	NT	10	12	NT	17.4%	13.8%	--	6.5	13.8
	Tier 3	NT	7	3	NT	6.5%	5.7%	--	5.4	4.3
Missing Number	Tier 1	NT	75	79	NT	76.1%	80.9%	--	81.7	77.6
	Tier 2	NT	15	15	NT	14.1%	10.3%	--	5.4	17.0
	Tier 3	NT	9	7	NT	9.8%	5.7%	--	12.9	5.3

AIMSweb Math Data First Grade		2013-2014 First Grade Composite Scores			2014-2015 First Grade Composite Scores			2015-2016 First Grade Composite Scores		
		F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Oral Counting Fluency	Tier 1	83%	91%	NT	77%	80.4%	NT	79.3	91.7	
	Tier 2	10%	6%	NT	13%	15.5%	NT	9.2	7.1	
	Tier 3	7%	4%	NT	10%	4.1%	NT	11.5	1.2	
Number Identification	Tier 1	77%	81%	80%	73.0%	80.5%	NT	80.4	90.6	
	Tier 2	16%	13%	15%	15.0%	14.4%	NT	16.1	8.2	
	Tier 3	8%	7%	6%	12%	5.2%	NT	3.4	1.2	
Quantity Discrimination	Tier 1	81%	77%	86%	82%	84.4%	92.5%	78.1	87.1	89.5
	Tier 2	10%	15%	10%	7%	9.4%	4.3%	14.9	9.4	5.8
	Tier 3	10%	7%	4%	11%	6.3%	3.2%	6.9	3.5	4.7
Missing Number	Tier 1	80%	73%	87%	83%	88.6%	89.4%	85	90.6	84.9
	Tier 2	14%	20%	10%	11%	8.2%	9.6%	11.5	5.9	10.5
	Tier 3	6%	7%	3%	6%	3.1%	1.1%	3.4	3.5	4.7
Math Comp	Tier 1	NT	83%	96%	NT	92.8%	95.7%	--	94.2	96.6
	Tier 2	NT	13%	2%	NT	4.1%	2.1%	--	3.5	1.2
	Tier 3	NT	3%	2%	NT	3.1%	2.1%	--	2.4	2.3

AIMSweb Math Data Second Grade		2013-2014 Second Grade Composite Scores <i>*Provided by another school within our district</i>			2014-2015 Second Grade Composite Scores			2015-2016 Second Grade Composite Scores		
		F	W	S	F	W	S	F	W	S
Math Comp	Tier 1	85.4	80.8	83.9	92.2%	91.8%	76.2%	95.7	92.4	80.7
	Tier 2	12.5	12.8	12.9	5.9%	5.2%	18.6%	3.3	7.6	17.2
	Tier 3	2.1	6.4	3.2	2.0%	3.1%	5.2%	1.1	0	2.2
Math CAP	Tier 1	60.4	67	83.2	72.6%	71.1%	81.4%	72.5	79.3	80.7
	Tier 2	30.2	28.7	10.5	17.6%	22.7%	13.4%	17.6	19.6	19.4
	Tier 3	9.4	4.3	6.3	9.8%	6.2%	5.2%	9.9	1.1	0

In math, a review of the data from the 2015-2016 school year as compared to the previous two year shows that the majority of students in K-2 at Washington School are performing at grade level in all areas.

In Kindergarten the data shows that Oral Counting, which has always been the strength for Kindergarten has again dropped from previous years as did missing number. The data also shows that overall the kindergarten's scores increased from fall to spring. OCF was down 6% (from the previous year), NI was up 4%, QD was up 1% and Missing MN was up 6%. While Kindergarten met the 79% goal, Number Identification, Quantity Discrimination and Missing Number was down 3% not quite meeting the 80% goal.

First grade students met the goal of 80% in all areas of Early Numeracy as well as Math COMP, based on the 3 year trend data scores were up in some areas while down in others. OC was up 11% NI was also up 10%, QD however was down 3%, MN was also down 5%. Math COMP remained steady at 96% for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year in a row. Most scores remained well above the 80% goal. It will be important to keep an eye on students to see how they progress next year, and make adjustments as necessary in these areas in order to meet our goals.

The data for second grade from 2013-2014 came from another school within our district, and it is unclear what goals were established. The trend data shows that in Math COMP scores are up 4% from last year. With regard to Math CAP, student scores have continued to decline over the last three years down 3%.

Although it would be expected that the percentage of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 would decrease as the year progresses, it should be noted that the goal increases at each testing, making the standard more difficult to reach. Students move between the tiers as their individual needs dictate and are given interventions based on the progress monitoring done weekly / bi-weekly

*The Assessment results in math indicate the following areas of concern:*

- Though the students are making progress, Tier 2 and Tier 3 some students are not making gains quickly enough to meet the ever increasing goals in Math.
- Significant numbers of students continue to struggle in Tier 2 and Tier 3 in the Early Numeracy skills of Oral Counting and Number Identification as these skills are not mastered and retained.

## ***Curriculum & Instruction***

During the evaluation of the 2014-2015 School-Wide Plan, the team looked at the following areas regarding curriculum and instruction: Instructional Programs and Materials, Technology and Support Personnel.

During the 2015-2016 School year the staff at Washington continued making CFA (Common Formative Assessments) for reading to strengthen the core academic programs. They also created and used SLO's (Student Learner Objectives) during both the fall and spring semesters. The Tiered Level Intervention Programs have been implemented in all classrooms for both reading and math. This program has been successful in identifying and providing interventions for those students that are not performing at grade level standards. In regard to instructional programs the team evaluated how effectively expectations were communicated to teachers, parents and students regarding what students can and should learn. Although the team felt this area was satisfactory, it was indicated that there is always room for improvement when it comes to communication with parents. Currently information is communicated through AIMSWeb reports and local assessment data shared with parents at parent/teacher conferences each 9 weeks as well as phone calls, e-mails and agenda entry.

All classrooms are equipped with at least 2 computers with headphones. All classrooms are equipped with Smart Boards at this time. Teachers incorporate classroom computers into their lessons whenever possible, and utilize the computer lab, Smart Boards, Chrome book lab and I-Pad lab on a regular basis. Students use computers for Accelerated Reader tests, word and math games, supplemental tutorial lessons, and enrichment programs as often as possible. Over the summer of 2014 upgrades were made to the internet to resolve past issues, and allow technology to run more smoothly.

Washington School has paraprofessionals that provide support in delivering the interventions for students that are not performing at a Tier I level. These paraprofessionals are well trained and experienced. The team noted how invaluable paraprofessionals are in providing student assistance and delivery of high quality services.

### ***Highly Qualified Professional Staff***

Washington School has 5 Kindergarten teachers and 4 first grade teachers and 4 second grade teachers. In addition, the staff includes 2 Title 1 teachers (1 Reading and 1 Math), 2 special education teacher, (provided through Mid-State Special Education Cooperative) and 7 paraprofessionals. Washington also has a full time physical education teacher.

Washington has several positions that are shared with other schools in the district. These include the school nurse, art teacher, music teacher, school psychologist, social worker, speech therapist, and technology coordinator. This has resulted in the pupil to teacher ratio remaining relatively low at 18.2% overall for elementary classrooms within the district in 2015-2016. All of the teachers at Washington Elementary remain NCLB highly qualified.

Data collected on the district teaching staff indicates that in the previous 4 years, the average teaching experience has slowly begun to increase, from a low of 13.5 in 2012 to our current 15.6. The upward trend has been due in large part to teacher retirements that have NOT been replaced by younger, less experienced teachers. The financial health of the state as well as this district has made it difficult to replace teachers and rather the district has been utilizing the teaching resources it currently has. It should be noted that these numbers do not reflect the last 3 years as that data has not been posted by the state. It is expected that this trend might continue. In addition, prior to this year, trend data for the district, indicates that the percentage of teachers with a bachelor's degree has steadily decreased from 86%(2011) to 74.5% while the number of teachers with a Master's degree has increased from 14% (2011) to 25.5%. Many factors affect these trends including the retirement of older teachers, who did not go on to get a Master's Degree. Younger teachers, continuing their education in order to increasing their salary in tough financial times, as well as an increase in the amount of financial incentive for teachers to obtain additional credit hours and degrees.

As the district anticipates difficult financial times ahead, it is likely that these trends will continue. As experienced teachers retire and are replaced with younger, less experienced, less expensive teachers. In some cases, retiring teachers and paraprofessionals may not be replaced at all which will result in an increase in the pupil/teacher ratio. This will be an area of concern for the school.

School Year	Total FTE		Gender		Avg. Teacher Experience	Teachers BA/BS (%)	Teachers MA/MS (%)	Student - Teacher Ratio		Classes Taught by NHQ
	Tch.	Adm.	F	M				Elem.	H.S.	
2011	92		77.1	22.9	13.9	86.0	14.0	15.5	15.9	0
2012	90		77.0	23.0	13.5	79.7	20.3	15.9	15.2	0
2013	85		*	*	*	78.7	21.3	16.3	16.5	0
2014	83		*	*	*	79.5	20.5	16.3	16.2	0
2015	91		*	*	*	73.7	26.3	18.5	16.2	0
2016	91		*	*	15.6	74.5	25.5	18.2	18.5	0

Pana C.U.S.D. #8 has a highly qualified staff. It should be noted that the over the last three years some information has not been reported by the state (\*) Challenges facing the district and Washington School will be to continue to maintain the lower student to staff ratio and continue to recruit and retain highly qualified staff.

### ***Family and Community Involvement***

During the evaluation of the 2015-2016 school wide plan, it was noted that Parental involvement and communication continues to be positive, and we need to continue with all the current activities and events while thinking of ways to increase attendance at some of the lesser attended events. Parental Involvement will continue to be a focus as there are always more parents to reach, in addition, several of the items mentioned in the plan continue to remain a need.

- *Communication* – Additional effort is needed by teachers to help build positive relationships with parents and students. Encouraging parents to contact teachers with questions and concerns. Positive relationships nurtured to improve communication between parents and teachers to ensure that academic issues are being addressed by both parties and to increase positive student outcomes.
- *Education* – a need to instruct parents and students about good study skills and to provide parents with opportunities to learn ways to help their children achieve in school.
- *Character Development*- Teaching parents how to model respectful and responsible behavior.
- *Reading*- Parents encouraging their children to read for pleasure. Provide parents with programs to help them read with their children.
- *Connection*- Adult volunteers routinely used in the school.

The team also identified the following strengths:

- *Shared Leadership* – Programs are available to guide teachers to assist parents in knowing what teachers expected, and that parents and teachers believe they can make a difference for children.
- *Communication* – Frequent communication between teachers and parents.
- *Education* – The team identified several strengths in this area including the following: Teachers have high expectations for academics and behavior, students are receiving additional help when needed and are encouraged to do their best work, Washington is proud of the general atmosphere of respect for each other and authority, and that students receive a solid grounding in basic skills and subjects.
- *Connection* – Teachers, staff and administrators are friendly and helpful to students and parents. They foster a friendly atmosphere conducive to learning. Teachers enjoy working at the school and with each other. Students are encouraged to help one another. Volunteers are utilized well by some of the staff.

Family and community involvement is an area in which significant progress has been made, yet also an area that continually needs focus. During the 2016-2017 school year, Washington Elementary is planning several events. Our first fall activity, Annual Title One School-Wide Parent Meeting, which is intended to inform parents about the School-Wide Title One program as well as provide children with books and activities and parents with educational handouts and resources. This event has proven to be difficult to get parents to attend, and has been noted several times that providing a snack or meal with the program has increased attendance, but not to the degree that we would like.

Other events that were very successful last year that we intend to repeat this year include the Pre-Halloween Handouts Party which is an opportunity to connect with parents again and provide resources instructing parents and students on good study skills and ways to improve success at school. By planning this event in the afternoon just prior to the children's parties, we are able to catch a large number of parents and grandparents, some of whom are unable to attend evening events. In the spring we would like to expand our Spring Art and Music Show to include more parent participation. Last year's carnival theme was very successful. Another way Washington Elementary is able to communicate with parents is through the parent portal which allows parents to access student information, the newsletters (Panther Paws), the district website (School Success website) and Facebook page. Finally, the Smart Buddies Program is making positive changes in the lives of children on a daily basis. Communication and relationship between students, parents, and the faculty can always be improved.

### ***School Context and Organization***

In evaluating School Context and Organization, the team considered the following: class size; school mission, vision, and motto; coordination plan; management and governance; and student discipline policy. During the 2016 – 2017 school year the school and the district will continue to focus on implementing our mission, vision and motto through our PLC groups and our PBIS program.

The team identified the school climate as one of the strengths in this area. This was attributed to, in large part, the positive interactions between staff and students throughout the building. An additional identified strength was the Coordination Plan. This plan will ensure that the students' instructional day is coordinated to ensure the optimum amount of educational opportunity and contact time.

The team identified two areas of concern. First, while student discipline policies are in place and the new PBIS program has had several successful years, it is a program that will continually need attention. The three tiers will continue to be developed and improved over the next year. To this end during the 2016-17 School year, Washington Elementary will continue the implementation of the PBIS program with the tier 2 check in check out system. We will also continue to monitor our PBIS goals to make sure that they are current and providing us with reliable and usable data.

Secondly, there is a need for continued concern regarding small class sizes in order to provide the best possible academic atmosphere for our students. As the district anticipates difficult financial times during the next few years we also anticipate that the number of students per class will increase as it becomes more difficult to replace retiring teachers. The increased number of students per class will affect both the behavior within the class as well as the one on one time teachers are able to provide each student. With this in mind, we will need to be extra diligent in monitoring both academic as well as behavioral issues and providing interventions.

## ***Priority Needs***

The team identified the following priority needs:

1. Continue to increase parent involvement.
2. Better communication.
3. Additional special programs and educational opportunities for all students.
4. Strengthened discipline policy pertaining to high absenteeism and resulting in positive attitudes for teachers, students, and parents.
5. Building a strong sense of community between parents, schools, students and Administration.
6. Classroom technology use increased with the addition of quality equipment.

## ***Program Goal(s): Academic***

The following program goals were established by the team:

1. By the spring of 2016-2017 School Year, 80% of all K-2 students, tested at Washington Elementary using the AIMSWeb assessment(s) for math will score above the 25<sup>th</sup>ile in math as measured by the histogram report of the AIMSWeb assessment.
2. By the spring of 2016-2017 School year, 80% of all K-2 students tested at Washington Elementary using the AIMSWeb assessment(s) for Reading will score above the 25<sup>th</sup>ile in each of the Early Literacy & Reading components as measured by the histogram report of the AIMSWeb assessment.
3. By the spring of 2016-2017 school year, 70% of the students in Tier 2 using the check in check out will meet their daily goal of 80%. This data will be collected and measured by the PBIS team and classroom teachers using an in house data collection system.
4. During the 2016-2017 school year Washington Elementary will increase attendance at parental involvement activities by having 80% of the parents / guardians (and/or significant adults) of Washington School's Kindergarten First and Second Grade students attend at least 2 parental involvement activities as measured by Sign In Sheets.

\*\*\* In addition the following MAP Pilot Program goals were also established.

1. By the spring of 2016-2017 School year 80% of all K-2 students, tested at Washington Elementary using the MAP Assessment Program for Math will score at or above the 40<sup>th</sup>ile in overall performance.
2. By the spring of 2016-2017 School Year, 80% of all K-2 students, tested at Washington Elementary using the MAP Assessment Program for Reading will score at or above the 40<sup>th</sup>ile in overall performance.



## **Section 2: School-wide Reform Strategies**

Over the last four years, Pana C.U.S.D. #8 and Washington Elementary School have embarked on the process of implementing the following reform strategies: The Alignment to National Standards, and the creation of Common Formative Assessments (CFA's) and Student Learner Objectives (SLO's). This year 2016-2017 the district will be focusing Piloting the new MAP Assessment program, with the goal of switching by the fall of 2017.

The primary goal for implementing CFA's / SLO's is to provide opportunities for all children to meet proficient and advanced levels of student achievement they emphasize the focus on student learning. The addition of the MAP Assessment Program to replace the AIMSWeb program will provide additional data to support the new common core standards as well as align with the districts CFA and SLO assessments. Within this model the school answers the questions of "What do we want students to learn?", "How do we know they have learned it?", "What do we do when they don't learn?" and "What do we do when they already know it?"

The process of organizing standards and creating CFA's / SLO's is characterized by creating a collaborative environment in which the members have a shared mission and vision for the school. It results in a cultural shift from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning that is supported by research-based instructional strategies, and the infusion of technology solutions to support instruction. These assessments will be used to identify what students already know prior to teaching. This data can then be used to drive instruction, and provide teachers with a clearer picture of what instructional strategies need to be used and which children will need additional or differentiated instruction.

## **Section 3. Highly Qualified Teachers**

During the 2015-2016 school years, all teachers at Washington Elementary were Highly Qualified. In addition, all paraprofessionals had 60 hours of undergraduate credits and/or Provisional Certification. The staff was utilized in the best ways possible to meet the needs of the students. The Pana Unit #8 School District makes hiring Highly Qualified Teachers and Paraprofessionals a high priority.

## **Section 4. Highly Qualified and On-going Professional Development**

In 2008, the district began the processes of implementing the Professional Learning Community (PLC) model district wide. Since that time, leadership teams have been developed at the school and district level focused on the development of the professional learning community and the improvement of instruction for student learning.

As a component of this implementation, the district and Washington Elementary have implemented a three tiered level of instruction to provide differentiation and to meet the needs of individual students. To that end, much of the professional development provided to staff has focused on the use of grade level data teams, and the creation of common formative assessments, Student Learner Objectives and the Implementation of the new MAP Assessment Program. The district has also focused on the importance of data-driven decision making, and strategies to differentiate instruction within the three-tiered model.

During the 2016-2017 school year, teachers at Washington School will again meet one day each week for 45 minutes to work on school improvement initiatives with the intent of improving student instruction. The focus of the PLC work will be to create and implement common formative assessments and Student Learner Objectives. In addition, as a team, they will use the data and informal discussion to drive future instruction.

In addition to the collaboration time built into the schedule, teachers will have the opportunity to participate in local and regional institutes and workshops. The district partners with the Regional Office of Education which provides professional development for K-12 teachers in this area. Also, as more technology, such as the use of Smart Boards, chrome books and tablets are integrated into the curriculum, professional development to improve these instructional skills will be needed.

## **Section 5. Strategies to attract Highly Qualified teachers.**

The district is committed to attracting and employing teachers that demonstrate an ability to differentiate instruction and collaborate with colleagues to meet the needs of individual learners. As interview teams, led by the building principal, review candidates credentials, they look for not only a strong foundation in their subject area, but evidence of the teacher's knowledge of current, research-based, instructional strategies.

At the present time, all of the staff in the district is NCLB highly qualified. The district will need to continue to offer a competitive starting salary and benefits in order to attract the best teachers. In addition, the support of a collegial atmosphere where teachers can interact and grow professionally with their colleagues will foster an environment in which teachers will enjoy working.

## **Section 6. Strategies to increase parental involvement**

Washington Elementary School has been successful in communicating with parents. The school has been able to have 100% parent contact through parent/teacher conferences, open house, progress and quarterly grade reports, and various forms of home/school communication such as newsletters and teacher/district websites. In addition, the buildings Parent Coordinator has led the Title I staff in providing a number of parent involvement activities aimed at assisting parents with the education of their children.

During the 2016-2017 school year, Washington Elementary is planning several events. Our first fall activity, the Annual Title One Parent Meeting is intended to inform parents about the School-Wide Title One program as well as provide children with books and activities and parents with educational handouts and resources. The Halloween Handout Party is an opportunity to connect with parents again and provide activities and resources instructing parents and students on good study skills and ways to improve success at school. In the spring we would like to expand our Spring Art and Music Show to include more parent participation. Communication and relationship between students, parents, and the faculty can always be improved.

Parents and community members are also utilized as volunteers in the classroom and school programs. An example of this is the Smart Buddy program in which a volunteer is paired with an at-risk student who can benefit from having an adult role model. This has been a very successful program.

At the same time, Washington needs to continue to examine ways to involve parents. New and varied parent involvement activities need to be available. Also, the parent/teacher organization will need to be strengthened. Currently, attendance at these meetings has been relatively low. Many of our students come from low-income homes or from homes in which both parents work. For this reason, it is sometimes difficult to get parents involved in traditional parent activities, especially those offered during the day. The parent coordinator, staff, and administration need to continue to explore ways to offer opportunities to parents for involvement in their children's education.

## **Section 7. Plans for assisting pre-school children in the transition from early childhood programs.**

The district does work closely with programs such as the P.R.E.P. program that is housed in Washington Elementary School. This program is for 3 to 4 year old, at-risk students. Although the teachers and resources for the program are funded by a grant obtained from a neighboring district, the students are essentially members of the district's student population.

With the pre-school program being housed in Washington Elementary School, communication between the pre-school teacher and the Kindergarten teachers is easily accomplished. Teachers in both programs are able to communicate with each other about the expectation and needs of their students. In addition, students in the Pre-K program become familiar with the facilities and staff that they will encounter when they are enrolled in Kindergarten. Thus the transition from Pre-School to Kindergarten is made easier by their Pre-K experience.

Each year, students in Head Start visit Washington School to become acquainted with the staff and become familiar with the facilities. Due in large part to the Professional Learning Community model, communication between the Head Start staff and Washington Elementary Staff has increased. The increased communications and interactions should result in an easier, more productive transition for early childhood students to the Kindergarten program.

## **Section 8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessment.**

Currently teachers at Washington School have become increasingly involved in the use of assessment data to make coordinated decisions leading to the improvement of student instruction. Three times each year, all students are assessed with AIMSWeb in Reading and Math. Students are then placed in the tiered level of instruction to meet their academic needs. Based on the assessments, students are then provided with the appropriate intervention. Students in Tiers 2 and 3 are monitored throughout the year to evaluate their progress and make the appropriate adjustments to the interventions being used and the student's placement in the tiers. In addition this year the Staff is piloting the MAP Assessment program, which will replace the AIMSWeb program in the fall of 2017.

As the district continues its implementation of the Professional Learning Community, the teaching staff at Washington will participate in professional development focused on data driven instruction. During the 2016-17 school year district staff will continue to be trained in ways to improve data teams and make the most of the data they are collecting. One of the key elements of PLC's is the utilization of common formative assessments and student learner objectives to make data driven decisions. During the specified PLC time, teachers will collaborate and continue the process of creating common formative assessments, student learner objectives and aligning both with the National Common Core Standards. The assessments will measure the academic progress of students on Essential Standards. Based on the results of these assessments, data teams can meet to discuss modifications to the program of instruction which will then improve student learning.

In addition to AIMSWeb, other common assessments will provide multiple data points to enhance the decision making process. Teachers at Washington Elementary will have access to assessment data from several sources in addition to AIMSWeb. These include Accelerated Reader, STAR, and SRA Building Blocks for Math.

The district has developed an approved curriculum for each grade level. However, as the staff continues to implement the PLC model they will be using the Essential Standards for their grade and subject area in the creation of Common Formative Assessments and Student Learner Objectives. By identifying these standards and utilizing common formative assessments, teachers can make appropriate, timely adjustments to student instruction.

## **Section 9. Provide effective and timely assistance to low achieving students.**

As described above, the tiered level instruction model with frequent progress monitoring is used to ensure that low achieving students receive timely and effective assistance. After each AIMSWeb universal assessment, the data is reviewed and students are placed in the appropriate tier. Those students that are not meeting the established benchmarks are placed in Tier 2 or 3 depending on their level of need. Once placed in these tiers, students receive additional instructional time beyond the core curriculum. During this time, research-based interventions are used to address the specific deficiencies for each student. The interventions are provided by classroom teachers, special education teachers, Title I teachers, and paraprofessionals. The progress of the students is then monitored frequently to determine if the interventions are meeting their needs. The staff has access to the data from the progress monitoring and based on this information make the needed adjustments to instruction.

## **Section 10. Coordination and integration of all Federal, State, and local services.**

The district has regularly attempted to coordinate the use of federal, state, and local funds to maximize the resources that are available for student learning. Funds from the federal Title I program and local resources have been used to provide supplemental support services for students that are academically at risk in reading. Title I and local sources are used to provide similar supports for math. Title II has supplemented district resources to maintain smaller class sizes at the elementary level and contributes to professional development programs for the district. In addition, Title VI funds were combined with local resources to support technology resources throughout the district.

Other programs such as transportation and food service are also supported by the coordination of local, state, and federal funds. When funds are available, extended day and year programs are offered (e.g. after school tutoring, summer school) to at-risk students. In addition, the district receives support for telecommunication services and Internet access through discounts obtained from the federal E-Rate program. Title VI funds have been used to purchase software and hardware needed to support the integration of technology in the classroom. Given the high percentage of low-income families, the district is heavily reliant on general state aide and federal funds to supplement local revenues. Without this coordination of funds, the district would have difficulty meeting our students' needs.

## Annual Evaluation

As a part of the school improvement process, at least once each year, the building principal, with assistance from the Title I coordinator and parent coordinator will conduct an evaluation of the school-wide program for Washington Elementary School. Input from teachers and parents will be sought through meetings and/or surveys to provide data on the effectiveness of the program. The data collected will then be used by the school improvement team to make recommendations or modifications to the school-wide and school improvement plans. The plans will be reviewed with parents at least annually. Parents will be given the opportunity to review the plans and provide feedback.

The administration and staff will use the results of both local assessments as an indicator of the effectiveness of the school-wide program. Throughout the year, the staff will utilize data collected locally from AIMSWeb to make modifications and differentiate student instruction. This ongoing use of data will enable staff to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions used in the program.

Both the results from the progress monitoring and AIMS Web assessments will be provided to parents in a language that they can understand. With AIMS Web, parents receive an individual report for their child along with an interpretation guide at each 9 weeks. This report provides information on how their child is progressing, and compares performance to the other students as a whole. In addition, parents will receive assessment data at parent teacher conferences scheduled in the fall and the spring. Assessment data collected throughout the year will also be shared with parents as decisions are made regarding a child's placement in a tier of instruction.

2016-2017 Title One Evaluation & Planning Team

Cheri Wysong \_\_\_\_\_

Rebecca Mahnke \_\_\_\_\_

Cindy Denning \_\_\_\_\_

Erica LaMarche \_\_\_\_\_

Lindsey Kerby \_\_\_\_\_

Jenny Lehn \_\_\_\_\_

Candy Byars \_\_\_\_\_

Jody Hay \_\_\_\_\_

Jessica Niehart \_\_\_\_\_

Jessica Miller \_\_\_\_\_

Wendy Mundell \_\_\_\_\_

Whitney Reynolds \_\_\_\_\_

## Adoption of Title I School-wide Plans

The Title I School-wide Plan(s) for Washington Elementary School, were adopted by the Pana C.U.S.D. #8 Board of Education on \_\_\_\_\_. The plans will be made available to parents of students at each school for review and comment at least once each year.

---

*(Signature of Authorized Official)*

---

*(Date)*