## 1) Assign a Schoolwide Program Review Team

Title 1 regulations require that a school operating a schoolwide program annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program. The school must revise its plan as necessary based on the results of the evaluation to ensure the continuous improvement of student achievement.

## 1A) Schoolwide Program Review Team

Core Team - Highlighted yellow

| Name | Title | Stakeholder Group |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cheri Wysong | Title 1 Director | District Staff |
| Juletta Ellis | Principal | Administrator |
| Dena Smith | Math Intervention Teacher | Licensed Staff |
| Sara Kallal | Science Teacher | Licensed Staff |
| Mark Schmitz | Parent/Social Studies Teacher | Licensed Staff/Parent Seacher |
| Matt Miller |  |  |

## Chosen Members

The Title director and intervention teachers at Pana Jr. High School based their team selection on respective stakeholder roles and interest. The goal was to include administration, licensed staff, and community members. The core team consists of C. Wysong, D. Smith, and S. Kallal. The Schoolwide Title Team (SWTT) consists of all names mentioned above.

Tasks

| Wysong | Provide Agendas for meetings <br> Assist/guide Title 1 team by providing helpful resources/answering <br> questions. <br> Keep team accountable (documentation, agendas, etc) <br> Attend meetings when schedule allows <br> Review and analyze data if needed <br> Assist with making changes to Schoolwide Title Plan if needed <br> Encourage communication among all team members |
| :--- | :--- |


| Ellis | Assist/guide Title 1 team by providing helpful resources <br> Keep team accountable (documentation, agendas, etc) <br> Attend meetings when schedule allows. <br> Review and analyze data if needed <br> Assist with making changes to Schoolwide Title Plan if needed <br> Encourage communication among all team members |
| :--- | :--- |
| Smith | Data Collector <br> Data Entry <br> Gather and share Parent Involvement documentation <br> Review and analyze data <br> Note taker if needed <br> Assist with creating surveys <br> Make contacts with other team members through e-mail, and/or <br> phone calls regarding meetings/events |
| Kallal | Data Collector <br> Data Entry <br> Gather and share Parent Involvement documentation <br> Review and analyze data <br> Note taker if needed <br> Assist with creating surveys <br> Make contacts with other team members through e-mail, and/or <br> phone calls regarding meetings/events |


| Schmitz | Provide a teacher's perspective of student and parent needs <br> Provide information regarding Eighth Grade classroom parent <br> events <br> Assist with creating surveys <br> Assist with creating graphs that reflect collected data <br> Assist with evaluating Schoolwide Title 1 Plan <br> Assist with making changes to the Schoolwide Title 1 plan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Miller | Provide a parent's perspective of student and parent needs <br> Provide a mentor's perspective of student needs <br> Assist with creating surveys <br> Assist with evaluating Schoolwide Title 1 Plan <br> Assist with making changes to the Schoolwide Title 1 plan |

1C Documentation: Attendance, Agenda, Minutes attached at end of Evaluation Report

| Date/Time | Location | Agenda Topics | Attendees |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $8 / 27 / 2018$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Planning Meeting <br> Reviewing/gathering data <br> Team members chosen | Core Team |
| $9 / 24 / 2018$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Discussion/overview of plans <br> for completing Schoolwide <br> Title Evaluation | Core Team |
| $10 / 22 / 2019$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Reviewing/gathering data | Core Team |
| $11 / 18 / 2018$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Interpreted, analyzed data <br> and entered data into written <br> format | Core Team |
| $12 / 12 / 2018$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Interpreted, analyzed data <br> and entered data into written <br> format | Core Team |
| $1 / 23 / 2019$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Interpreted, analyzed data <br> and entered data into written <br> format | Core Team, <br> Administration |


| $2 / 20 / 2019$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Revision of written format and <br> included information | Core Team, <br> Administration |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 / 19 / 2019$ | Reading <br> Intervention Room, <br> PJHS | Revision of written format and <br> included information | Core Team, <br> Administration |
| $4 / 24 / 2019$ | Math Intervention <br> Room, PJHS | Re-formatting, reorganizing of <br> documents into new approved <br> template | Core Team |

## 2) Data Collection

## 2A) Types of Data

| Student Achievement Data <br> (PARCC, Academy <br> of Math, MAP) | Perception Data <br> (Surveys, Reflection Notes, <br> Event documents, list of <br> District PI Team) | Demographic Data <br> (Attendance, Truancy, <br> Ethnicity, Low-Income, Sp. <br> Ed) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dena Smith | Sara Kallal | Illinois Interactive Report <br> Card (IIRC) |
| Sara Kallal |  | Student Information System |$|$| Bonnie Sowarsh |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2B) Overview of Data Collection

## Student Achievement Data

D. Smith and S. Kallal collected and interpreted IAR and MAP data. B. Sowarsh provided behavior data reports.

## IAR

Pana Jr. High School students in grades 6, 7 and 8 are assessed annually with the IAR The IAR measures individual student achievement relative to the Common Core Standards. The results give parents, teachers, and school another measure of student learning and school performance. The IAR assesses both reading and math for the 6th, 7th and 8th grades. Students are tested on the Common Core for Reading and Math.

## Perception

Sara Kallal collected Parent Involvement documentation/data.

## Demographic Data

J. Ellis and C. Wysong provided the core team with demographic data from these sources: Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC), Student Information System, and the PJHS School Report Card.

Pana Junior High School is a grade 6, grade 7 and grade 8 building of approximately 306 students located in Christian County Illinois. Pana Junior High is one of four schools in the Pana C.U.S.D \#8 School District. The district also includes two elementary schools, and one high school. Pana C.U.S.D \#8 has a school population of roughly 1,312 students and a community population of approximately 6,000 people. Demographically, the city of Pana is a challenged economic community with many families living below the poverty index. Approximately 65 percent of the student population in Pana qualify for free and reduced lunch programs.

The following information is used to compile the Comprehensive Needs Assessment.

Data Profile

1. Student Enrollment by Gender

| Year | Total Enrollment | \# Male | \% Male | \# Female | \%Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2018-2019$ | 306 | 151 | 49 | 155 | 51 |
| $2017-2018$ | 286 |  |  |  |  |
| $2016-2017$ | 294 | 148 | 50.3 | 146 | 49.7 |
| $2015-2016$ | 273 | 142 | 52 | 131 | 48 |
| $2014-2015$ | 283 | 102 | 54 | 87 | 46 |
| $2013-2014$ | 189 |  |  | 53 | 134 |

## 2. Student Enrollment by Ethnicity

| Year | Total <br> Enrollment | Black | \% <br> American <br> Indian | Hispanic | $\%$ Asian/Pacific <br> Islander | White | $\%$ Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $2018-2019$ | 306 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 97.4 | 1.3 |
| $2017-2018$ | 286 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 97 | 1 |
| $2016-2017$ | 294 | 0 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 95.2 | 2 |
| $2015-2016$ | 273 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 94.5 | 2.2 |


| $2014-2015$ | 283 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 96.5 | 1.8 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2013-2014$ | 189 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 97.9 | 1.1 |

## 3. Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch Program

| Year | Number | Percent of Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2018-2019$ | 199 | 65 |
| $2017-2018$ | 183 | 64 |
| $2016-2017$ | 190 | 64.6 |
| $2015-2016$ | 184 | 67 |
| $2014-2015$ | 103 | 65 |
| $2013-2014$ |  | 55 |

## 4. Students Participating by the Title 1 Program

| Year | Number | Percent of Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2018-2019$ | 137 | 46 |
| $2017-2018$ | 134 | 47 |
| $2016-2017$ | 135 | 46 |
| $2015-2016$ | 144 | 52.7 |


| $2014-2015$ | 117 | 41.3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $2013-2014$ | 79 | 41.8 |

## 5. Student Attendance

| Year | Avg. Daily Attendance | \% of Student Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2018-2019$ | 281 | 94 |
| $2017-2018$ | 271.7 | 95 |
| $2016-2017$ | 279.3 | 95 |
| $2015-2016$ | 259.9 | 95.2 |
| $2014-2015$ | 265.7 | 93.9 |
| $2013-2014$ | 178.0 | 94.2 |

## 6. Student Mobility Rate

| Year | Full Academic Year (FAY) |  | Non Full Academic Year (NFAY) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | \# Students | \% Student <br> Population | \# Students | \% Student <br> Population |


| $2018-2019$ | 20.8 | 7 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $2017-2018$ | 14.3 | 5 |  |  |
| $2016-2017$ | 20.3 | 6.9 |  |  |
| $2015-2016$ | 22.0 | 8.2 |  |  |
| $2014-2015$ | 32.0 | 11.3 |  |  |
| $2013-2014$ | 19.1 | 10.1 |  |  |

## Student Truancy Rate

| Year | Average Daily Truancy | \% of Student Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2018-2019$ | 30.6 | 10 |
| $2017-2018$ | 20 | 7 |
| $2016-2017$ | 14.1 | 4.8 |
| $2015-2016$ | 0 | 0 |
| $2014-2015$ | 5.9 | 2.1 |
| $2013-2014$ | 3.9 | 2.1 |

## 8. Students Identified as English Language Learners

(ELL)

| Year | Program Enrollment | \% of Student Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2018-2019$ | 0 | 0 |


| $2017-2018$ | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $2016-2017$ | 0 | 0 |
| $2015-2016$ | 0 | 0 |
| $2014-2015$ | 0 | 0 |
| $2013-2014$ | 0 | 0 |

## 9. Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) and Paraprofessionals

| Number of Certified Teacher | Number of HQT | Number of Non HQT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | 21 | 0 |
| Number of Paraprofessionals | Number of HQT <br> Paraprofessionals | Number of Non HQT <br> Paraprofessionals |
| 5 | 5 | 0 |

10. Teaching Experience

|  | Years of Experience |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Certified <br> Teachers | $0-2$ | $3-5$ | $6-10$ | $11-14$ | $15-20$ | $20+$ |
| 21 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 6 |

## 11. Education

|  | Level of Education |
| :--- | :--- |


| Number of <br> Certified <br> Teachers | Bachelor's | Bachelor's <br> +15 | Master's | Master's <br> +15 | Doctorate | National <br> Board <br> Certification |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | 14 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

## 3) Data Analysis

## MAP

## 6th Grade Reading

The mean RIT score went up 1.6 points from fall to spring. The norm grade level mean RIT score went up 4.8 from fall to spring. Thirteen fewer students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. Fifty-two students (56\%) increased their RIT scores, 39 students ( $42 \%$ ) decreased their RIT score, and $2(2 \%)$ had the same RIT score from fall to spring. Twenty-seven students (29\%) increased their percentile rank, 59 students ( $63 \%$ ) decreased their percentile rank, and $7(8 \%)$ had the same percentile rank from fall to spring.

|  | Lo <br> \%tile <21 | LoAvg <br> \%tile 21-40 | Avg <br> \%tile 41-60 | HiAvg <br> \%tile 61-80 | Hi <br> $\%$ tile >81 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Literary Text- <br> Language Craft <br> and Structure <br> Fall | $15 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Literary Text- <br> Language Craft <br> and Structure <br> Spring | $17 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Literary Text- <br> Key Ideas and <br> Details <br> Fall | $17 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Literary Text - <br> Key Ideas and <br> Details Spring | $23 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Informational <br> Text- <br> Language, | $18 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $18 \%$ |


| Craft, and <br> Structure <br> Fall |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Informational <br> Text- <br> Language, <br> Craft, and <br> Structure <br> Spring | $15 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Informational <br> Text- Key <br> Ideas and <br> Details <br> Fall | $21 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Informational <br> Text- Key <br> Ideas and <br> Details <br> Spring | $23 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Vocabulary <br> Fall | $18 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Vocabulary <br> Spring | $19 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

Sixth grade reading is a concern because 13 fewer students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. It is also a concern because all areas showed an increase in the percentage of students who scored in the below average categories from fall to spring except for Information Text- Language, Craft, and Structure.

## 7th grade Reading

The mean RIT score went up 3.6 points from fall to spring. The norm grade level mean RIT score went up 3.8 from fall to spring. Six fewer students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. Sixty-five students (73\%) increased their RIT scores, 21 students ( $24 \%$ ) decreased their RIT score, and 3 (3\%) had the same RIT score from fall to spring. Forty-six students (52\%) increased their percentile rank, 41 students (46\%) decreased their percentile rank, and $2(2 \%)$ had the same percentile rank from fall to spring.

|  | Lo <br> \%tile $<21$ | LoAvg <br> \%tile 21-40 | Avg <br> \%tile 41-60 | HiAvg <br> \%tile 61-80 | Hi <br> \%tile $>81$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Literary Text- <br> Language Craft <br> and Structure <br> Fall | 17\% | 17\% | 25\% | 30\% | 11\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Literary TextLanguage Craft and Structure Spring | 20 | 19\% | 21\% | 25\% | 15\% |
| Literary Text- <br> Key Ideas and <br> Details <br> Fall | 17\% | 19\% | 21\% | 27\% | 16\% |
| Literary Text - <br> Key Ideas and <br> Details Spring | 16\% | 20\% | 13\% | 31\% | 20\% |
| Informational <br> Text- <br> Language, <br> Craft, and <br> Structure <br> Fall | 12\% | 17\% | 31\% | 20\% | 19\% |
| Informational <br> Text- <br> Language, <br> Craft, and <br> Structure <br> Spring | 16\% | 21\% | 20\% | 21\% | 22\% |
| Informational <br> Text- Key <br> Ideas and <br> Details <br> Fall | 15\% | 22\% | 20\% | 25\% | 18\% |
| Informational <br> Text- Key <br> Ideas and <br> Details <br> Spring | 15\% | 26\% | 20\% | 15\% | 23\% |
| Vocabulary <br> Fall | 13\% | 13\% | 27\% | 27\% | 19\% |
| Vocabulary <br> Spring | 18\% | 19\% | 20\% | 29\% | 15\% |

Seventh grade reading is a concern because 6 fewer students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. It is also a concern because all areas showed an increase in the percentage of students who scored in the below average categories from fall to spring except for Literary Text, Key Ideas and Details, which had the same percentage of students who scored in the below average categories from fall to spring.

## 8th Grade Reading

The mean RIT score went up 2.4 points from fall to spring. The norm grade level mean RIT score went up 2.9 from fall to spring. Eight fewer students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. Sixty-four students (63\%) increased their RIT scores, 34 students ( $33 \%$ ) decreased their RIT score, and 4 (4\%) had the same RIT score from fall to spring. Forty-six students (45\%) increased their percentile rank, 49 students ( $48 \%$ ) decreased their percentile rank, and 7 (7\%) had the same percentile rank from fall to spring.

|  | Lo <br> \%tile <21 | LoAvg <br> \%tile 21-40 | Avg <br> \%tile 41-60 | HiAvg <br> \%tile 61-80 | Hi <br> \%tile >81 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Literary Text- <br> Language Craft <br> and Structure <br> Fall | $16 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Literary Text- <br> Language Craft <br> and Structure <br> Spring | $15 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Literary Text- <br> Key Ideas and <br> Details <br> Fall | $18 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Literary Text - <br> Key Ideas and <br> Details Spring | $19 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Informational <br> Text- <br> Language, <br> Craft, and <br> Structure <br> Fall | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Informational <br> Text- <br> Language, | $15 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $13 \%$ |


| Craft, and <br> Structure <br> Spring |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Informational <br> Text- Key <br> Ideas and <br> Details <br> Fall | $21 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Informational <br> Text- Key <br> Ideas and <br> Details <br> Spring | $19 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Vocabulary <br> Fall | $13 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Vocabulary <br> Spring | $11 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $12 \%$ |

Eighth grade reading is a concern because 8 fewer students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. It is also a concern because all areas showed an increase in the percentage of students who scored in the below average categories from fall to spring except for Information Text- Language, Craft, and Structure and Informational Text - Key Ideas and Details.

## Math

6th Grade
The mean RIT score went up 7.5 points from fall to spring. The norm grade level mean RIT score went up 7.7 from fall to spring. One more student was at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. Eighty-three students (89\%) increased their RIT scores, 9 students (10\%) decreased their RIT score, and 1 (1\%) had the same RIT score from fall to spring. Forty-eight students (52\%) increased their percentile rank, 37 students ( $40 \%$ ) decreased their percentile rank, and $8(8 \%)$ had the same percentile rank from fall to spring.

|  | Lo <br> \%tile <21 | LoAvg <br> \%tile 21-40 | Avg <br> \%tile 41-60 | HiAvg <br> \%tile 61-80 | Hi <br> $\%$ tile $>81$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  <br> Algebraic Thinking <br> Fall | $22 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $3 \%$ |


|  <br> Algebraic Thinking <br> Spring | $28 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Real \& Complex <br> Number Systems <br> Fall | $20 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Real \& Complex <br> Number Systems <br> Spring | $20 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Geometry <br> Fall | $35 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Geometry <br> Spring | $28 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
|  <br> Probability <br> Fall | $41 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
|  <br> Probability <br> Spring | $28 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $6 \%$ |

An area of concern for sixth grade math Real \& Complex Number Systems and Statistics and Probability because there was an increase in the percentage of students who tested in the below average categories from fall to spring. One reason for this is that Statistics and Probability are not considered a high priority according to the Learning Standards.
An area of strength is Statistics and Probability and Geometry both had decreases in the Lo category.

## 7th Grade

The mean RIT score went up 7.7 points from fall to spring. The norm grade level mean RIT score went up 6 points from fall to spring. Nine more students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. Eighty students (90\%) increased their RIT scores, 7 students ( $8 \%$ ) decreased their RIT score, and 2 ( $2 \%$ ) had the same RIT score from fall to spring. Sixty students (68\%) increased their percentile rank, 27 students (30\%)decreased their percentile rank, and 2 (2\%) had the same percentile rank from fall to spring. level RIT in the spring.

|  | Lo <br> $\%$ tile $<21$ | LoAvg <br> \%tile 21-40 | Avg <br> \%tile 41-60 | HiAvg <br> $\%$ tile 61-80 | Hi <br> $\%$ tile $>81$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  <br> Algebraic Thinking <br> Fall | $19 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  <br> Algebraic Thinking <br> Spring | $23 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Real \& Complex <br> Number Systems <br> Fall | $23 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Real \& Complex <br> Number Systems <br> Spring | $22 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Geometry <br> Fall | $23 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Geometry <br> Spring | $22 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
|  <br> Probability <br> Fall | $31 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
|  <br> Probability <br> Spring | $22 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

An area of concern for seventh grade math is Real and Complex Number Systems because there was an increase in the percentage of students who tested in the below categories. An area of strength is that 7th grade saw decreases in the overall below average percentages in 3 out of the 4 categories.

## 8th Grade

The mean RIT score went up 6.9 points from fall to spring. The norm grade level mean RIT score went up 4.6 from fall to spring. Eleven more students were at or above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the spring than in the fall. Eighty-six students (83\%) increased their RIT scores, 13 students (13\%) decreased their RIT score, and 4 (4\%) had the same RIT score from fall to spring. Fifty-nine students ( $57 \%$ ) increased their percentile rank, 36 students ( $36 \%$ ) decreased their percentile rank, and 7 (7\%) had the same percentile rank from fall to spring.

|  | Lo <br> \%tile $<21$ | LoAvg <br> \%tile 21-40 | Avg <br> \%tile 41-60 | HiAvg <br> \%tile 61-80 | Hi <br> \%tile $>81$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  <br> Algebraic Thinking <br> Fall | $28 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  <br> Algebraic Thinking <br> Spring | $20 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Real \& Complex <br> Number Systems <br> Fall | $18 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Real \& Complex <br> Number Systems <br> Spring | $16 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Geometry <br> Fall | $32 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Geometry <br> Spring | $18 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
|  <br> Probability <br> Fall | $21 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
|  <br> Probability <br> Spring | $21 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $6 \%$ |

An area of concern for eighth grade is that Real and Complex Number Systems shows an increase in the percentage of students who scored in the below average categories from fall to spring. An area of strength is that there was a significant increase in Operations and Algebraic Thinking in the HiAvg category.

## 4) Review the Current Schoolwide Plan

## 4A) Overview

Pana Jr. High's Title I program consists of small group instruction (1-7 students), large group instruction ( $7-15$ students), as well as a quantity of co-teaching with 6 th grade students. A typical day for all tier level (I, II, III) students consists of a nine period day. One period is laid out in design for a supplemental focus on reading, math, and Interventions. This period is known to students as resource. During resource, students receive additional assistance in reading or math based on their needs.

Students selected to participate in Tier II and Tier III level reading intervention and instruction are determined by a MAP Assessment score. Students who attend reading "Intervention Period" take part in scientifically researched interventions, consisting of SRA, Read Naturally, Small Group, Vocabulary Instruction.

## Title I Math Program

Students selected to participate in Tier II and Tier III level math intervention and instruction are determined by MAP Assessment score.
Students who attend math "Intervention Period" take part in scientifically researched interventions, consisting of MAP Skills Navigator, Academy of Math and Xtra Math. The Academy of Math is designed for students who are working below grade level. The computer-based program starts the student at their current level while focusing on word problems, operations and terms within ten different skills areas, (Number Sense, Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, Division, Equations, Fractions, Measurement, Geometry, and Graphing.) It is designed to supplement the PJHS core curriculum while allowing the students to have success at the level they are at currently.

## 5B) Focus Goals

The following program goals were established by the team:

1. To increase student success in the areas of reading and math
2. To increase parent and family involvement for the benefit of the students

## Required Components

## Component 1: Schoolwide Reform Strategies

The primary goal for implementing these structures is to provide opportunities for all children to meet proficient and advanced levels of student achievement.
Schoolwide Reform Strategies:
PLC:(Professional Learning Communities) changes the focus from teaching to learning that is supported by research based instructional strategies
TLI:(Tier Level Instruction) MAP (tiers 1, 2, and 3)
PBIS:Behavior Plan
CFA:(Common Formative Assessments)
SLO (Student Learner Objective) given by each teacher to drive instruction.
PBL:(Project Based Learning) Elective courses where students are engaged in problem solving which leads to the creation of a project and/or product.

## Component 2: Instruction by Highly Qualified Teachers

Implementation: All teachers and paraprofessionals are highly qualified by NCLB standards. Teachers and paraprofessionals are keeping documentation update and accurate.

## Component 3: Professional Development

## Implementation:

All staff is given two professional development days to attend workshops and seminars. In addition to that, the PLC extended school day allows for teachers and administration to meet for collaboration.

## Component 4: High Quality Teacher to High Need Schools

## Implementation:

Single span grade centers and all attendance centers based on the districts make up. The Jr. High has twelve core teachers, three special education teachers, two title one teachers, a shared music teacher, a shared art teacher, a shared band teacher, one p.e. teachers, and a shared resource teacher. This is a total of twenty-one certified teachers.

## Component 5: Parent Involvement

Implementation: This year the Parent Involvement Coordinator (PIC) for PJHS has supplied the PJHS parents, families, and students with seven family friendly events at the Jr. High. In August, the PIC and staff put together a 6th grade Orientation and an Open-House providing students and families with a meet and greet with the teachers, a glimpse into the expectations of a 6th, 7th, or 8th grade student, and a fun introduction to the layout of the building, and a Chromebook introduction meeting. In September, we presented Screenagers, which presented information to parents and students regarding social media. We held the annual Title One meeting to inform the families and parents about our Title I Parental Involvement Plan and our Schoolwide Plan in September, as well. In October, PJHS held Student Led Conferences that allowed students to speak about their accomplishments and areas of needed work to their
parent/guardians. In February, we had a parent meeting to explain high school courses available for our $8^{\text {th }}$ graders. Our final event came in May with our PBL Showcase which displayed each class and some of the things the students learned during that period.

## Component 6: Transition Strategies

Implementation: PJHS enrolls students in grades 6th, 7th, and 8th. Because of this, this school does not have direct coordination with preschool programs. We do assist in the transition of students between Lincoln and the Jr. High. We have our 8th grade students write a letter to a $6_{\text {th }}$ grade student telling him/her about the Jr. High and the expectations. We invite the $6^{\text {th }}$ grade students to the building for lunch and a tour with some of our upper students acting as tour guides. We have a meeting for the parents and students just before school starts to allow for questions and concerns to be addressed.

## Component 7: Data Driven Decisions

PJHS will include teachers in decisions about the use of academic assessment information for the purpose of improving student achievement-This year PJHS will be using data from: IAR, MAP, and CFAs.

## Component 8: Effective and Timely Additional Assistance

Effective and timely additional assistance for students who have difficulty mastering the standards at proficient and advanced levels will be provided. PJHS administers assistance based on tiered levels of instruction beyond the core instruction offered. Low performing students were identified using MAP. Every student at Pana Jr. High School is assessed using the MAP assessment.

## Component 9: Coordination of Programs

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 as well as the state Reading Improvement Block Grant, 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.

## Component 10: Needs Assessment

Comprehensive Needs Assessment- Each school looks at demographic data on our students and teaching staff.
The student and staff data used is in the tables above. The student data PJHS uses is the low income population, mobility rate, students with an IEP, race, achievement, and gender. The data PJHS uses for teaching staff is years of experience, level of education, and the curriculum and instruction used.

## 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 and needs assessment of the schoolwide program for Pana Junior High School. Input from teachers, parents, and students will be sought through 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 schoolwide 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 and state student assessments to determine the effectiveness of the schoolwide program. Annually, the staff will review the results of the state assessments to make adjustments or modifications to student instruction in an effort to continue to improve student performance outcomes.

Throughout the year, the staff will utilize data collected locally from MAP 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 state assessment and the local student assessments from MAP will be provided to parents in a language that they can understand. With PARCC, parents receive an individual report for their child along with an interpretation guide each fall. This report provides information on whether or not their child met state standards and how their performance compares 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.

## Adoption of Title I School-wide Plans

The Title I School-wide plan for Pana Junior High School, was adopted by the Pana C.U.S.D. \#8 Board of Education on . The plans are made available to parents of students at each
school for review and comment at least once a year. Current Title I School-wide plans are available online at www.panaschools.com.
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