Pana Junior High School - Schoolwide Title I Plan - November 2016

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
Paul Lauff	Principal	Administrator
Dena Smith	Reading Intervention Teacher	Licensed Staff
Sara Kallal	Math Intervention Teacher	Licensed Staff
Mark Schmitz	Science Teacher	Licensed Staff
Gayle Perry	Parent/Math 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. Kallal. The Schoolwide Title Team (SWTT) consists of all names mentioned above.

Tasks

Wysong	Provide Agendas for meetings Assist/guide Title 1 team by providing helpful resources/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
Lauff	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
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
Kallal	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
Gayle Perry	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

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

Date/Time	Location	Agenda Topics	Attendees
8/25/2015	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Planning Meeting Reviewing/gathering data Team members chosen	Core Team
9/22/2015	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Discussion/overview of plans for completing Schoolwide Title Evaluation	Core Team
10/19/2015	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Reviewing/gathering data	Core Team
11/30/2015	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Interpreted, analyzed data and entered data into written format	Core Team
12/21/2015	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Interpreted, analyzed data and entered data into written format	Core Team
1/15/2016	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Interpreted, analyzed data and entered data into written format	Core Team, Administration
2/12/2016	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Revision of written format and included information	Core Team, Administration
3/16/2016	Reading Intervention Room, PJHS	Revision of written format and included information	Core Team, Administration
4/15/2016	Math Intervention Room, PJHS	Re-formatting, reorganizing of documents into new approved template	Core Team

---

2) Data Collection

2A) Types of Data

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

2B) Overview of Data Collection

Student Achievement Data

D. Smith and S. Kallal collected and interpreted PARCC data, AimsWeb data for both reading and math (fall, winter, spring benchmarks), as well as AutoSkill Academy of Math. B. Sowarsh organized and collected data from the MAP tests.

PARCC

Pana Jr. High School students in grades 6, 7 and 8 are assessed annually with the PARCC The PARCC 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 PARCC assesses both reading and math for the 6th, 7th and 8th grades. Students are tested on the Common Core for Reading and Math.

AIMSweb

Every 6th, 7th and 8th grade student at Pana Jr. High School is assessed using the AIMSweb formative assessment system. The AIMSweb assessment system, informs the teaching and learning process of students by providing continuous student performance data, as well as, assisting in informing student gains to parents, teachers, and administrators all the while allowing more evidence-based evaluation and data-driven instruction. AIMSweb assessments specific to reading, determine student comprehension and fluency levels. The MAZE assesses reading comprehension (understanding what the student has read), while the R-CBM assesses reading fluency (ability to read smoothly, accurately, and with expression). AIMSweb assessments specific to math, determine student concepts, applications, and computation levels. The M-CAP assesses math concepts and applications (general math problem solving skills) and the M-COMP assesses math computations (addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division of different types of math problems). Benchmark assessments are given to the entire student body three times during the year, during the fall, winter, and spring. Results are then compared to national aggregate norms provided by AIMSweb. Students who did not meet the national norms, are progress monitored and tested each week to closely observe gains or declines in comprehension and fluency scores for reading, and computation and/or concepts and applications scores for math. These students are also provided interventions to help reinforce and support the student with whatever skill(s) they may be struggling with.

Perception

Dena Smith collected Parent Involvement documentation/data.

Demographic Data

P. Lauff 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 273 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 1,314 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
2015-2016	273	**142**	**52**	**131**	**48**
2014-2015	283	**149**	**53**	**134**	**47**
2013-2014	189	**102**	**54**	**87**	**46**

2. Student Enrollment by Ethnicity

Year	Total Enrollment	% Black	% American Indian	% Hispanic	%Asian/Pacific Islander	% White	%Other
2015-2016	273						
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
2015-2016		
2014-2015	**184**	**65**
2013-2014	**103**	**55**

4. Students Participating by the Title 1 Program

Year	Number	Percent of Population

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
2015-2016		
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 Population	# Students	% Student Population
2015-2016				
2014-2015	**32.0**	**11.3**		
2013-2014	**19.1**	**10.1**		

7. Student Truancy Rate

Year	Average Daily Truancy	% of Student Population
2015-2016		
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
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
24	24	0
Number of Paraprofessionals	Number of HQT Paraprofessionals	Number of Non HQT Paraprofessionals
4	4	0

10. Teaching Experience

	Years of Experience					
Number of Certified Teachers	0-2	3-5	6-10	11-14	15-20	20+
	1	1	6	8	3	5

11. Education

	Years of Experience					
Number of Certified Teachers	Bachelor's	Bachelor's +15	Master's	Master's +15	Doctorate	National Board Certification
	14	1	7	2	0	1

3) <u>Data Analysis</u>

AimsWeb Data
Rising Star Data 2015/2016

6th Grade R-CBM (Reading Fluency)
In the fall, 14 (15%) students tested into tier 3, 34(37%) tested into tier 2, and 43 (47%) tested into tier 1. In the spring, 14 (16%) of students tested into tier 3, 33 (37%) tested into tier 2, and 42 (47%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tiers 1 and 2 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tier 3.

6th Grade MAZE (Reading Comprehension)
In the fall, 10 (11%) students tested into tier 3, 25 (27%) tested into tier 2, and 56 (61%) tested into tier 1. In the spring, 13 (14%) of students tested into tier 3, 31 (35%) tested into tier 2, and 45 (51%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 1 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tier 2 and 3.

7th Grade R-CBM (Reading Fluency)
In the fall, 10 (11%) students tested into tier 3, 24 (27%) tested into tier 2, and 55 (62%) tested into tier 1. In the spring, 16 (19%) of students tested into tier 3, 30 (35%) tested into tier 2, and 40 (46%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 1 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tiers 2 and 3.

7th Grade MAZE (Reading Comprehension)
In the fall, 6 (7%) students tested into tier 3, 23 (26%) tested into tier 2, and 60 (67%) tested into tier 1. In the spring, 9 (10%) of students tested into tier 3, 33 (37%) tested into tier 2, and 46 (52%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 1 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tier 2 and 3.

8th Grade R-CBM (Reading Fluency)
In the fall 17 (20%) students tested into tier 3, 15 (17%) tested into tier 2, and 55 (63%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 16 (18%) of students tested into tier 3, 25 (29%) tested into tier 2, and 46 (53%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 3 and 1 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tier 2.

8th Grade MAZE (Reading Comprehension)
In the fall 17 (20%) students tested into tier 3, 15 (17%) tested into tier 2, and 55 (63%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 16 (18%) of students tested into tier 3, 25 (29%) tested into tier 2, and 46 (53%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tiers 1 and 3 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tier 2.

6th Grade CAP (Math Concepts and Applications)
In the fall 24 (26%) students tested into tier 3, 18 (20%) tested into tier 2, and 49 (54%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 19 (21%) of students tested into tier 3, 19 (21%) tested into tier 2, and 52 (58%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 3 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tiers 1 and 2.

6th Grade COMP (Math Computation)
In the fall 18 (20%) students tested into tier 3,26 (29%) tested into tier 2, and 47 (51%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 7 (8%) of students tested into tier 3, 33 (36%) tested into tier 2, and 50 (56%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 3 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tiers 1 and 2.

7th Grade CAP (Math Concepts and Applications)
In the fall 12 (14%) students tested into tier 3, 35 (41%) tested into tier 2, and 39 (45%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 4 (5%) of students tested into tier 3, 32 (36%) tested into tier 2, and 52 (59%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tiers 2 and 3 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tier 1.

7th Grade COMP (Math Computation)
In the fall 23 (26%) students tested into tier 3, 11 (13%) tested into tier 2, and 53 (61%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 3(3%) of students tested into tier 3, 15 (17%) tested into tier 2, and 69 (79%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 3 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tiers 1 and 2.

8th Grade CAP (Math Concepts and Applications)
In the fall 2 (2%) students tested into tier 3, 32 (37%) tested into tier 2, and 53 (61%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 7 (8%) of students tested into tier 3, 20 (23%) tested into tier 2, and 60 (69%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tier 2 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tiers 1 and 3.

8th Grade COMP (Math Computation)
In the fall 8 (9%) students tested into tier 3, 22 (26%) tested into tier 2, and 56 (65%) tested into tier 1. In the spring 7 (8%) of students tested into tier 3, 21 (24%) tested into tier 2, and 60

(68%) tested into tier 1. There was a decrease in the number of students who tested into tiers 2 and 3 and an increase in the number of students who tested into tier 1.

MAP

6th Grade Reading

Forty-four students increased their RIT from fall to spring. Forty students decreased their RIT scores from fall to spring. Three students had the same RIT scores in the spring as they did in the fall.

The overall mean MAP score increased by 0.6 points from fall to spring. The standard deviation increased from 14.4 to 15.1 from the fall to the spring. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do increased. As the skills became more difficult, the lower students didn't appear to be able to maintain or show growth in that area. Sixth grade students overall scored 0.7 RIT points above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, but scored 0.5 points below the norm mean grade level RIT in the spring.

	Lo %tile <21	LoAvg %tile 21-40	Avg %tile 41-60	HiAvg %tile 61-80	Hi %tile >81
Literature Fall	13%	20%	23%	20%	23%
Literature Spring	21%	17%	27%	16%	19%
Info Txt Fall	17%	14%	30%	23%	16%
Info Txt Spring	21%	20%	27%	18%	13%
Vocab Fall	16%	16%	30%	24%	14%
Vocab Spring	25%	25%	17%	19%	15%

Sixth grade reading is a concern since most areas showed an increase in the percentage of students who scored in the Lo and LoAvg areas from fall to spring.

7th grade Reading

Forty-eight students increased their RIT score from fall to spring. Thirty-one students decreased their RIT score from fall to spring. Five students had the same RIT score in the spring as they did in the fall.
The overall mean MAP score for 7th grade increased by 1.8 RIT points from fall to spring. The standard deviation increased from 13 to 13.9 from the fall to the spring. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do increased. As the skills became more difficult, the lower students didn't appear to be able to maintain or show growth in that area. Seventh grade students overall scored 1.8 RIT points above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 0.5 points above the norm mean grade level RIT in the spring.

	Lo %tile <21	LoAvg %tile 21-40	Avg %tile 41-60	HiAvg %tile 61-80	Hi %tile >81
Literature Fall	15%	22%	13%	31%	20%
Literature Spng	18%	20%	19%	24%	18%
Info Txt Fall	14%	24%	29%	21%	13%
Info Txt Spring	18%	26%	24%	15%	17%
Vocab Fall	17%	18%	29%	17%	18%
Vocab Spring	19%	27%	16%	18%	19%

Based on the data in the chart above, an area of concern is the percentage of students who increased in the Lo and LoAvg areas and the percentages of students who decreased at the HiAvg and Hi categories.

8th Grade Reading
Thirty-six students increased their RIT score from fall to spring. Forty-two decreased their RIT score from fall to spring. Eight students had the same RIT score in the spring that they had in the fall.
The standard deviation increased from 10.8 to 12.7 from the fall to the spring. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do increased. As the skills became more difficult, the lower students

didn't appear to be able to maintain or show growth in that area. Eighth grade students overall scored 3.3 RIT points above the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, but scored 0.2 points below the norm mean grade level RIT in the spring.

	Lo %tile <21	LoAvg %tile 21-40	Avg %tile 41-60	HiAvg %tile 61-80	Hi %tile >81
Literature Fall	11%	20%	26%	29%	14%
Literature Spng	19%	17%	30%	24%	9%
Info Txt Fall	11%	14%	37%	18%	20%
Info Txt Spring	23%	15%	28%	15%	10%
Vocab Fall	10%	20%	37%	20%	13%
Vocab Spring	20%	22%	27%	18%	8%

The overall mean MAP score for 8th grade decreased by 1.2 RIT points from fall to spring. Based on the data in the chart above reading at the 8th grade level is a concern because these students did not demonstrate an ability to maintain their scores as the skill level increased.

Math

6th Grade

Seventy-seven students increased their RIT from fall to spring. Seven students decreased their RIT scores from fall to spring. Five students had the same RIT scores in the spring as they did in the fall.

The overall mean MAP score increased by 7.9 points from fall to spring. The standard deviation increased from 14 to 17.1 from the fall to the spring. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do increased. As the skills became more difficult, the lower students didn't appear to be able to maintain or show growth in that area. Sixth grade students overall scored 6.8 RIT points below the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 5.5 points below the norm mean grade level RIT in the spring.

	Lo %tile <21	LoAvg %tile 21-40	Avg %tile 41-60	HiAvg %tile 61-80	Hi %tile >81
Operations & Algebraic Thinking Fall	32%	27%	20%	17%	4%
Operations & Algebraic Thinking Spring	22%	28%	26%	18%	7%
Real & Complex Number Systems Fall	26%	16%	24%	26%	4%
Real & Complex Number Systems Spring	19%	27%	27%	17%	11%
Geometry Fall	23%	31%	28%	13%	4%
Geometry Spring	26%	22%	22%	22%	8%
Statistics & Probability Fall	33%	30%	22%	11%	3%
Statistics & Probability Spring	29%	20%	17%	22%	12%

An area of concern for sixth grade math is how far below the norm grade level mean RIT score they are as a whole.

They have shown considerable growth in most areas. With the exception of geometry, all areas showed a decrease in the percentage of students who scored in the LO category from fall to spring. With the exception of Operations and Algebraic Thinking, all areas showed a decrease in the percentage of students who scored in the LoAvg category from fall to spring. Most areas

had an increase in the percentage of students who scored in HiAvg and Hi categories from fall to spring.

7th Grade

Sixty-nine students increased their RIT from fall to spring. Fourteen students decreased their RIT scores from fall to spring. Two students had the same RIT scores in the spring as they did in the fall.

The overall mean MAP score increased by 5.8 points from fall to spring. The standard deviation decreased from 13.3 to 12.9 from the fall to the spring. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do decreased. Sixth grade students overall scored 4.5 RIT points below the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 3.8 points below the norm mean grade level RIT in the spring.

	Lo %tile <21	LoAvg %tile 21-40	Avg %tile 41-60	HiAvg %tile 61-80	Hi %tile >81
Operations & Algebraic Thinking Fall	30%	14%	28%	21%	8%
Operations & Algebraic Thinking Spring	16%	32%	25%	22%	6%
Real & Complex Number Systems Fall	28%	25%	21%	16%	10%
Real & Complex Number Systems Spring	16%	31%	26%	22%	6%
Geometry Fall	29%	20%	21%	16%	10%
Geometry Spring	23%	33%	20%	16%	8%
Statistics & Probability Fall	17%	20%	22%	17%	6%
Statistics & Probability Spring	22%	31%	27%	11%	9%

An area of concern for seventh grade math is how far below the norm grade level mean RIT score they are as a whole. The percentage of students who Scored in the Hi category decreased in almost every area from fall to spring. The percentage of students who scored in the HiAvg category increased or stayed the same for all areas when comparing the fall scores to the spring scores.
An area of strength for the seventh grade math is that they showed growth from the fall to the spring. With the exception of the statistics and probability goal area, all areas showed a decrease in the percentage of students who scored in the Lo category.

Seventy-seven students increased their RIT from fall to spring. Seven students decreased their RIT scores from fall to spring. Five students had the same RIT scores in the spring as they did in the fall.
The overall mean MAP score increased by 7.9 points from fall to spring. The standard deviation increased from 14 to 17.1 from the fall to the spring. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do increased. As the skills became more difficult, the lower students didn't appear to be able to maintain or show growth in that area. Sixth grade students overall scored 6.8 RIT points below the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 5.5 points below the norm mean grade level RIT in the spring.

8th Grade

Seventy students increased their RIT from fall to spring. Thirteen students decreased their RIT scores from fall to spring. Four students had the same RIT scores in the spring as they did in the fall.
The overall mean MAP score increased by 5 points from fall to spring. The standard deviation increased from 10.7 to 14.7 from the fall to the spring. This indicates that the difference between what the highest functioning students could do and what the lowest functioning students could do increased. Eighth grade students overall scored 1.8 RIT points below the norm grade level mean RIT score in the fall, and scored 0.6 below the norm mean grade level RIT in the spring.

	Lo %tile <21	LoAvg %tile 21-40	Avg %tile 41-60	HiAvg %tile 61-80	Hi %tile >81
Operations & Algebraic Thinking Fall	6%	35%	34%	21%	4%
Operations & Algebraic Thinking Spring	9%	26%	30%	31%	5%

Real & Complex Number Systems Fall	10%	33%	27%	23%	7%
Real & Complex Number Systems Spring	13%	27%	23%	31%	5%
Geometry Fall	11%	19%	47%	17%	7%
Geometry Spring	7%	20%	34%	32%	7%
Statistics & Probability Fall	13%	28%	33%	21%	4%
Statistics & Probability Spring	16%	17%	30%	26%	11%

An area of concern for eighth grade math is that the Lo functioning students don't appear to be making progress in most goal areas from fall to spring.
There was a strong increase in the percentage of students who scored in the HiAvg category for all areas from fall to spring.

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 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.

Title I Reading Program

Students selected to participate in Tier II and Tier III level reading intervention and instruction are determined by several different assessments. Two norm-based

assessments provided by Pearson's AIMSweb are distributed three times throughout the year, during the fall, winter, and the spring. The assessments used are the Reading Curriculum Based Measurement (R-CBM) which assesses students' oral reading fluency and accuracy and also, the Curriculum Based Measurement-MAZE which assesses student's reading comprehension. 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 several different assessments. Two norm-based assessments provided by Pearson's AIMSweb are distributed three times throughout the year, during the fall, winter, and the spring. The assessments used are the CAP test which checks a student's understanding of Concepts and Applications in math, and the COMP which assesses how a student can do with Math Computation.

Students who attend math "Intervention Period" take part in scientifically researched interventions, consisting of *AutoSkill 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

RtI:(Response to Intervention) MAP and tiered level instruction (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 fourteen 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-five 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 three family friendly evenings at the Jr. High. In August, the PIC and staff put together an Open-House Scavenger Hunt 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. In September, PJHS held a Student Led Conferences that allowed students to speak about their accomplishments and areas of needed work to their parent/guardians. In October the Jr. High informed the families and parents about our Title I Parental Involvement Plan and our Schoolwide Plan.

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 6th grade student telling him/her about the Jr. High and the expectations. 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 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: PARCC, 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 AIMSweb. Every student at Pana Jr. High School is assessed using the AIMSweb formative assessment system. Students take the MAP assessment, which is used to determine which students may benefit from additional assistance, as well.

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 make AYP.

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 state assessment and the local student assessments from AIMSWeb 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.