Pana Junior High School Schoolwide Title I Plan - December 2020

1) Assign a Schoolwide Program Review Team

Title I 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 | | Stakeholder Group |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Cheri Wysong | Title I Director | District Staff |
| Juletta Ellis | Principal | Administrator |
| Dena Smith | Reading Intervention Teacher | Licensed Staff |
| Susan Ade | Math Intervention Teacher | Licensed Staff |
| Mark Schmitz | Science Teacher | Licensed Staff |
| Susan Ade | Parent/ Teacher | Licensed Staff/Parent |

1B) Overview

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. Ade. The Schoolwide Title Team (SWTT) consists of all names mentioned above.

<u>Tasks</u>

| Wysong Provid Assist/ | es/answering |
|--------------------------|--------------|
|--------------------------|--------------|

| | questions. Keep team accountable (documentation, agendas, etc) Attend meetings when schedule allows Review and analyze data if needed Assist with making changes to Schoolwide Title Plan if needed Encourage communication among all team members |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ellis | Assist/guide Title 1 team by providing helpful resources Keep team accountable (documentation, agendas, etc) Attend meetings when schedule allows. Review and analyze data if needed Assist with making changes to Schoolwide Title Plan if needed Encourage communication among all team members |
| Ade | Data Collector Data Entry Gather and share Parent Involvement documentation Review and analyze data Note taker if needed Assist with creating surveys Make contacts with other team members through e-mail, and/or phone calls regarding meetings/events |
| Smith | Data Collector Data Entry Gather and share Parent Involvement documentation Review and analyze data Note taker if needed Assist with creating surveys Make contacts with other team members through e-mail, and/or phone calls regarding meetings/events |
| Schmitz | Provide a teacher's perspective of student and parent needs Provide information regarding Eighth Grade classroom parent events Assist with creating surveys Assist with creating graphs that reflect collected data Assist with evaluating Schoolwide Title 1 Plan Assist with making changes to the Schoolwide Title 1 plan |
| Ade | Provide a parent's perspective of student and parent needs Provide a mentor's perspective of student needs Assist with creating surveys Assist with evaluating Schoolwide Title 1 Plan |

| Assist with making changes to the Schoolwide Title 1 plan | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| IC Documentation: Attendance, Agenda, Minutes attached at end of Evaluation Report | | | | | | |
| Date/Time | Location | Agenda Topics | Attendees | | | |
| 8/28/2019 | Reading Intervention Room, PJHS | Planning Meeting Reviewing/gathering data Team members chosen | Core Team | | | |
| 9/2/2019 | Reading Intervention Room, PJHS | Discussion/overview of plans for completing Schoolwide Title Evaluation | Core Team | | | |
| 10/30/2019 | Reading Intervention Room PJHS | Reviewing/gathering data | Core Team | | | |
| 1 1/27/2019 | Reading Intervention Room, PJHS | Interpreted, analyzed data and entered data into written format | Core Team | | | |
| 12/20/2019 | Reading Intervention Room, PJHS | Interpreted, analyzed data and entered data into written format | Core Team | | | |
| 1/22/2020 | Reading Intervention Room, PJHS | Interpreted, analyzed data and entered data into written format | Core Team, Administration | | | |
| 2/26/20/20 | Reading Intervention Room, PJHS | Revision of written format and included information | Core Team, Administration | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

2) Data Collection

2A) Types of Data

| Student Achievement Data (IAR, MAP, MobyMax) | Perception Data (Surveys, Reflection Notes, Event documents, list of District Team) | Demographic Data (Attendance, Truancy, Ethnicity, Low-Income, Sp. Ed) |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Dena Smith | Susan Ade | Illinois Interactive Report Card (IRC) |
| Susan Ade | | Student Information System |
| Bonnie Sowarsh | | PJHS School Report Card |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

2B) Overview of Data Collection

Student Achievement Data

D. Smith and S. Ade 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 NILS (New Illinois Learning Standards). The results give parents, teachers, and the 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

Dena Smith 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 299 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 district population of roughly 1,306 students and a community population of approximately 6,000 people. Demographically, the city of Pana is an economically challenged community with many families living below the poverty index. Approximately 60 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 1 | Enrolln | nent by | Gender |
|----|-----------|---------|---------|--------|
|----|-----------|---------|---------|--------|

| Year | Total Enrollment | # Male | ° Male | # Female | %Female |
|-----------|------------------|--------|--------|----------|---------|
| 2019-2020 | 299 | 149 | 49 | 152 | 51 |
| 2018-2019 | 306 | 151 | 52 | 131 | 48 |
| 2017-2018 | 286 | | | | |
| 2016-2017 | 294 | 148 | 50.3 | 146 | 49.7 |

2. Student Enrollment by Ethnicity

| Year | Total Enroll- ment | % Black | America n Indian | Hispanic | Asian/Pacific Islander | White | Other |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
| 2019-2020 | 282 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.7% | 0.4% | 96.5% | 1.8% |
| 2018-2019 | 297 | 0.7% | 0 | 0.3% | 0.3% | 97.4% | 1.3% |

| 2017-2018 | 286 | | | 2 | | | 97 | 1 | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------|--|---------|-------------|----|--|
| 2016-2017 | 294 | | 0.7 | 1.4 | | | 95.2 | 2 | |
| 3. Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch Program | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | | | Number | | | Percent | of Populati | on | |
| 2019-2020 | | | 178 | | | 58 | | | |
| 2018-2019 | | 193 | | | | | 65 | | |
| 2017-2018 | 2017-2018 | | 183 | | | | 64 | | |
| 2016-2017 | | 190 | | | | 64.6 | | | |
| 4. Stude | ents Particip | ating in the | he Title 1 P | rogram | | L | | | |
| Year | | Number | | | | | of Populati | on | |
| 2019-2020 | | 146 | | | | 49 | | | |
| 2018-2019 | | 144 | | | | 47 | | | |
| 2017-2018 | 2017-2018 | | 134 | | | 47 | | | |
| 2016-2017 | | | 135 | | | 46 | | | |

5. Student Attendance

| Year | Avg. Daily Attendance | % of Student Population |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 2019-2020 | 293.7 | 96 |
| 2018-2019 | 268.8 | 94 |
| 2017-2018 | 271.7 | 95 |
| 2016-2017 | 279.3 | 95 |

6. Student Mobility Rate

| | Full Academic Year (FAY) | | Non Full Academ | nic Year (NFAY) |
|-----------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-------------------------|
| | # Students % Student Population | | # Students | % Student Population |
| 2019-2020 | 14.1 | 5 | | |

| 2018-2019 | 20.8 | 7 | |
|-----------|------|-----|--|
| 2017-2018 | 14.3 | 5 | |
| 2016-2017 | 20.3 | 6.9 | |

7. Student Truancy Rate

| Year | Average Daily Truancy | % of Student Population |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 2019-2020 | 9 | 3 |
| 2018-2019 | 36 | 10 |
| 2017-2018 | 20 | 7 |
| 2016-2017 | 14.1 | 4.8 |

8. Students Identified as English Language Learners (ELL)

| Year | Program Enrollment | % of Student Population |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 2019-2020 | | 0 |
| 2018-2019 | | 0 |
| 2017-2018 | | 0 |
| 2016-2017 | | 0 |

9. Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) and Paraprofessionals

| Number of Certified Teacher | Number of HQT | Number of Non HQT |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 26 | 26 | |
| Number of Paraprofessionals | Number of HQT Paraprofessionals | Number of Non HQT Paraprofessionals |
| 5 | 5 | |

10. Teaching Experience

| | Years of Experience | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----|------|--|--|-----|
| Number of Certified Teachers | 0-2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | | | 20+ |

| 26 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 6 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|

11. Education

| | Level of Education | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--|
| Number of Certified Teachers | Bachelor's | Bachelor's +15 | Master's | Master's +15 | Doctorate | National Board Certification | |
| 26 | 17 | 0 | 5 | 3 | | 1 | |

3) Data Analysis

MAP Data lacks validity due to Covid. We were not able to test in the Spring as normal. Normal years would compare data from fall to spring; this year we only had fall to winter comparisons.

MAP 6th Grade Reading

Sixty-one students increased their RIT from fall to winter. Thirty students decreased their RIT scores from fall to winter. Five students had the same RIT scores in the winter as they did in the fall.

The overall mean MAP score increased by 3.3 points from fall to winter. The standard deviation decreased from 14.6 to 13.9 from the fall to the winter. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do decreased slightly. Sixth grade students overall scored 1.5 RIT points below the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 1.5 points below the norm mean grade level RIT in the winter.

| | Low 0>24th %tile | LoAvg 21-40 %tile | Avg 41-60 %tile | HiAvg 61-80%tile | Hi <81 %tile |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Literary TextLanguage Craft and Structure Fall | 20% | 20% | 20% | 23% | 15% |
| Literary TextLanguage Craft and Structure Winter | 22% | 13% | 25% | 25% | 15% |

| | 15% | 19% | 28% | 27% | 11% |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|
| Literary Text- Key Ideas and Details Fall | | | 2070 | 2770 | |
| Literary Text- Key Ideas and Details Winter | 21% | 16% | 24% | 27% | 12% |
| Info Txt Language, Craft, and Structure Fall | 22% | 19% | 21% | 24% | 12% |
| Info Txt Language, Craft, and Structure Winter | 22% | 22% | 21% | 22% | 14% |
| Info Text-Key Ideas and Details Fall | 23% | 18% | 19% | 26% | 13% |
| Info Text-Key Ideas and Details Winter | 20% | 23% | 22% | 24% | 12% |
| Vocab Fall | 16% | 14% | 23% | 36% | 10% |
| Vocab Winter | 15% | 16% | 22% | 27% | 20% |

Sixth grade concerns include Informational Text Key Ideas and Details because there was a 3% decrease in the percentage of students who scored in the HiAvg and Hi range, and a 2% increase in the percentage of students who scored in the Lo and LoAvg ranges from fall to winter. An area of strength is the percentage of students who scored in the Hi category for Vocab doubled.

7th grade Reading

Fifty-four students increased their RIT score from fall to winter. Forty-seven students decreased their RIT score from fall to winter. Six students had the same RIT score in the winter as they did in the fall.

The overall mean MAP score for 7th grade increased by 2.6 RIT points from fall to winter. The standard deviation decreased from 15.3 to 14 from the fall to the winter. This indicates that the gap between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning

students could do decreased. Seventh grade students overall scored 1 RIT point above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 1.1 points above the norm mean grade level RIT in the winter.

| | Low 0>24th %tile | LoAvg 21-40 %tile | Avg 41-60 %tile | HiAvg 61-80%tile | Hi <81 %tile |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Literary TextLanguage Craft and Structure Fall | 13% | 15% | 27% | 29% | 15% |
| Literary TextLanguage Craft and Structure winter | 19% | 9% | 24% | 37% | 11% |
| Literary Text- Key Ideas and Details Fall | 16% | 17% | 14% | 30% | 11% |
| Literary Text Key Ideas and Details Winter | 13% | 16% | 24% | 37% | 11% |
| Info Txt Language, Craft, and Structure Fall | 17% | 16% | 22% | 23% | 22% |
| Info Txt Language, Craft, and Structure Winter | 16% | 15% | 23% | 29% | 16% |
| Info Text-Key Ideas and Details Fall | 15% | 17% | 21% | 35% | 12% |
| Info Text-Key Ideas and Details Winter | 13% | 18% | 27% | 22% | 20% |
| Vocab Fall | 11% | 17% | 17% | 35% | 20% |

| Vocab | 13% | 14% | 34% | 24% | 14% |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Winter | | | | | |

.

An area of concern in 7th grade reading is that 13% of students scored in the Lo range of Literary Text Language, Craft, and Structure in the fall; that percentage increased to 19% in the winter. However, the students in the HiAvg and Hi ranges increased by 14%. Other areas of concern are with the HiAvg and Hi students in the areas of Vocabulary and Information text Key Ideas and Details. In both of these subcategories, the students showed a significant decrease in their ability to maintain their percentile rank from fall to winter.

8th Grade Reading

Fifty-one students increased their RIT score from fall to winter. Thirty-two decreased their RIT score from fall to winter. Four students had the same RIT score in the winter that they had in the fall.

The standard deviation decreased from14.9 to 14.5 from the fall to the winter. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do was slightly decreased. Eighth grade students overall scored 0.5 RIT points below the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 0.8 points above the norm mean grade level RIT in the winter.

| | Low 0>24th %tile | LoAvg 21-40 %tile | Avg 41-60 %tile | HiAvg 61-80%tile | Hi <81 %tile |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Literary TextLanguage Craft and Structure Fall | 18% | 16% | 15% | 33% | 17% |
| Literary TextLanguage Craft and Structure winter | 13% | 24% | 25% | 20% | 18% |
| Literary Text- Key Ideas and Details Fall | 18% | 22% | 19% | 20% | 20% |
| Literary Text Key Ideas and Details Winter | 15% | 18% | 29% | 17% | 21% |
| Info Txt Language, Craft, and Structure Fall | 19% | 23% | 20% | 19% | 18% |

| Info Txt Language, Craft, and Structure Winter | 15% | 20% | 25% | 17% | 23% |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Info Text-Key Ideas and Details Fall | 28% | 15% | 17% | 20% | 18% |
| Info Text-Key Ideas and Details Winter | 15% | 17% | 25% | 21% | 22% |
| Vocab Fall | 15% | 23% | 19% | 28% | 15% |
| Vocab Winter | 14% | 18% | 24% | 29% | 15% |

An area of concern for 8th grade Reading is in the category of Literary Text. Students were not able to maintain their percentage of students who scored in the HighAvg and Hi ranges. The drop was significant. An area of strength is that all other categories showed an increase in the percentage of students who scored in the HiAvg and Hi from fall to winter.

Math

6th Grade

The overall mean MAP score increased by 2.8 points from Fall (211.9) to Winter (214.7). The standard deviation stayed the same, at 12.4. The number of students at or above the norm grade level mean dropped from 44 in the Fall to 37 in the Winter. The sixth grade students overall scored 2.8 RIT points below the norm grade RIT score in the Fall and 4.9 RIT points below the norm grade RIT score in the Winter.

| Operations & Algebraic Thinking | Low 0>24th %tile 14% | LoAvg 21-40 %tile 31% | Avg 41-60 %tile 30% | HiAvg 61-80%tile 20% | Hi <81 %tile 5% |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Fall Operations & Algebraic Thinking Winter | 21% | 37% | 25% | 14% | 3% |

| Real & Complex Number Systems Fall | 16% | 24% | 21% | 26% | 12% |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Real & Complex Number Systems Winter | 18% | 24% | 22% | 18% | 20% |
| Geometry Fall | 19% | 26% | 26% | 23% | 6% |
| Geometry Winter | 25% | 25% | 28% | 20% | 3% |
| Statistics & Probability Fall | 19% | 28% | 27% | 20% | 6% |
| Statistics & Probability Winter | 28% | 23% | 32% | 16% | 1% |

Two areas of concern for sixth grade math are Geometry and Statistics/Probability because both areas saw significant increases in the number of students scoring in the Low category while the number of students scoring in the High category decreased. The reason for this could be the comparison of Fall to Winter scores versus the usual Fall to Spring comparison. Sixth grade math does not focus on Geometry or Statistics in the first semester. The topic area of Real and Complex Number Systems is a strength as we saw a nice shift of students moving from the High Average to the High category.

7th grade

The overall mean MAP scores increased by 2.3 points from Fall to Winter. (216.5 to 218.8). The standard deviation remained fairly constant at 14 for fall and 14.7 for winter. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do remained consistent. Seventh grade students overall scored 5.2 RIT points below the norm grade level mean in the Winter, with 31 out of 90 students scoring at or above the norm grade level mean.

| | Low <20 %tile | LoAvg 21-40 %tile | Avg 41-60 %tile | HiAvg 61-80%tile | Hi >80 %tile |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Operations & Algebraic Thinking Fall | 17% | 27% | 5% | 27% | 4% |
| | 21% | 29% | 31% | 17% | 4% |
| Operations & | | | | | |

| Algebraic Thinking Winter | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Real & Complex Number Systems Fall | 13% | 31% | 24% | 17% | 15% |
| Real & Complex Number Systems Winter | 14% | 22% | 33% | 17% | 13% |
| Geometry Fall | 23% | 28% | 27% | 15% | 8% |
| Geometry Winter | 22% | 36% | 23% | 16% | 3% |
| Statistics & Probability Fall | 20% | 29% | 29% | 16% | 5% |
| Statistics & Probability Winter | 23% | 29% | 23% | 20% | 4% |

An area of concern for 7th grade math is in the topic of Geometry where there was an increase in the number of LoAverage scores and a decrease in the Average and High categories. Again, Geometry is not an area of focus for the first semester of 7th grade. An area of strength would be in the topic of Real and Complex Number Systems where a significant number of scores seemed to move from the LoAverage to the Average category. Operations/Algebraic Thinking as well as Statistics/ Probability remained pretty consistent from Fall to Winter.

8th grade

The overall mean MAP scores increased by 2.9 points from Fall to Winter. The standard deviation only saw a slight increase from 14.8 to 15.2. Eighth grade does have the highest standard deviation of all three grade levels which indicates an increasing gap between the lowest and highest functioning students. Eighth grade students overall scored 3 RIT points below the norm grade level RIT score in the Fall, and 3.3 points below in the Winter. 43% of students in the fall were at or above the norm grade level and 40% of the students tested in the winter scored at or above the norm grade level.

| | Low <20th %tile | LoAvg 21-40 %tile | Avg 41-60 %tile | HiAvg 61-80%tile | Hi >80 %tile |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Operations & Algebraic Thinking Fall | 17% | 22% | 29% | 19% | 13% |
| Operations & Algebraic Thinking Winter | 17% | 25% | 24% | 19% | 15% |
| Real & Complex Number Systems Fall | 19% | 20% | 32% | 18% | 10% |
| Real & Complex Number Systems Winter | 18% | 31% | 25% | 15% | 11% |
| Geometry Fall | 17% | 28% | 27% | 16% | 12% |
| Geometry Winter | 20% | 27% | 27% | 20% | 5% |
| Statistics & Probability Fall | 23% | 27% | 24% | 19% | 8% |
| Statistics & Probability Winter | 18% | 25% | 31% | 13% | 14% |

The areas of Operations/Algebraic Thinking and Real/Complex Number Systems stayed mostly consistent across all skill levels. One highlight is that Real/Complex Number Systems saw some positive movement from LowAverage to Average. An area of strength was in the Statistics/Probability area where increases were made in both the Average and High categories as well as a decrease in the Low column. An area of concern for eighth grade math is that as a whole, the class continues to fall below the norm RIT score.

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 6th and 7th grade students. A typical day for all tier level (1, 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 a resource. During resource, students receive additional assistance in reading or math based on their needs.

Title I Reading Program

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

Title I Math Program

Students selected to participate in Tier II and Tier III level intervention and instruction are determined by MAP assessment scores and teacher recommendation. Students who attend math "resource" take part in scientifically researched based interventions using the MobyMax program. On this computer based program, students use two apps: Fact Fluency and Mathematics. Fact Fluency pretests on Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, and Division Facts and then builds each student up until mastery is reached in each operation. The Mathematics portion of MobyMax is designed for students who are working below grade level. It also pretests and starts students at their current functional level. The program's curriculum is based on the common core standards, so it supplements the PJHS core math curriculum while allowing students to have success at the level they are at.

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 ESSA standards. Teachers and paraprofessionals are keeping documentation updated and accurate.

Component 3: Professional Development Implementation:

All staff are 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 are based on the districts make up. The Jr. High has fifteen core teachers, three special education teachers, two title one teachers, a shared music teacher, a shared art teacher, a shared band teacher, two p.e. teachers, and a shared resource teacher. This is a total of twenty-six 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 6 family friendly events at the Jr. High. In August, the PIC and staff put together a 6th grade orientation night and an Open-House that provided students and families with a meet and greet with the teachers and a glimpse into the expectations of a 6th, 7th, or 8th grade students. In October, we held the annual Title One meeting to inform the families and parents about our Title I Parental Involvement Plan and our Schoolwide Plan and Student Led Conferences that allowed students to speak about their accomplishments and areas of needed work to their parents/guardians. In December, we had a movie night.

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. Normally, we do assist in the transition of students between Lincoln and the Jr. High, have our 8th grade students write a letter to a 6th grade student telling him/her about the Jr. High and the expectations, and we invite the 6th grade students to the building for lunch and a tour with some of our upper students

acting as tour guides. We would also have a meeting for the parents and students just before school starts to allow for questions and concerns to be addressed. However, due to Covid, we were not able to do these things this year.

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 additional 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 used 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 IAR, 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 Jr. High was adopted by the Pana CUSD #8 Board of Education on December 21st, 2020. The plan will be made available to parents of students at each school for review and comment at least once per year.

Signature of Authorized Official

Date