

## **Scranton Title 1 Evaluation**

**2014-2015**

### **Math Overview**

This year started out with 7 third grade Title students and ended the year with 6. Two students were identified, and one moved in. Fourth grade started with 3 Title students and ended with 3, one student moved away and one qualified. Tier 2 Math, which took place during Specials Time, serviced students that may have previously qualified for Title.

### **Everyday Mathematics End of Year Test**

This year we focused on the 5 Common Core Math Domains. Those domains are Operations & Algebraic Thinking (OA), Number & Operations Base Ten (NBT), Number & Operations-Fractions (NF), Measurement & Data (MD), and Geometry (G). Third grade Title students' average summative percent compared to third grade students was: OA - 78%(90); NBT – 73%(86); NF – 69%(86); MD - 81%(83); G - 75%(84). Fourth grade Title students' average summative percent compared to fourth grade students was: OA - 91%(91); NBT – 73%(90); NF – 83%(95); MD - 78%(91); G - 67%(91).

### **AIMS WEB Math**

Benchmark M-Comp and M-Cap were given to all students to monitor growth over time. They were given in the Fall, Winter and Spring. Data collected was used to create Tier math groups for all students and to guide instruction for Title students. From the beginning of the year to the end of the year the following gains were made by Title students. Third grade Comp average point gain was 25 points, Cap average point gain was 8 points. Fourth grade Title students' Comp average point gain was 43 points, Cap average point gain was 13 points.

ScotPad was used as an intervention for students scoring at the 45<sup>th</sup> percentile or below on AIMS Web benchmark tests. Fourth grade title students who engaged in this program showed an average composite growth of 37 percentiles and third grade title students showed an average composite growth of 8 percentiles on AIMS Web.

### **Kansas State Math Assessment**

No data was available this year. We are focusing efforts on helping students be more successful at understanding and communicating how they do math.

### **Math Curriculum Reflections**

We continue to use the three tiers of instruction, where classroom teachers deliver tier one, tier two is delivered to small groups by SPED and Title, and tier three is delivered by SPED and Title in a more intense one on one setting. Time to service title students is the biggest problem we face.

Collaboration will allow us to look at data to monitor student progress to better serve the students in Tiered instruction, and allow Title to be more focused. We continue to use the on-line Assessment Differentiated System to enter and analyze data.

An updated version of Everyday Math will be used next year.

### **Reading Overview**

All students at SAC received reading instruction at their instructional level through the use of Differentiated Reading Groups built into the Lead 21 program. Some students were getting a form of acceleration. All students participated in Tier 2 reading instruction to meet their individual needs through intervention or enrichment. Title I students were identified by using the Aimsweb Oral Reading passage and their DRA scores. If students weren't making adequate progress, they were identified for Title I Reading Services. 19 third graders and 9 fourth graders entered the SAC Title I Reading program. All students except for one received some type of Tier 3 instruction. 2 of the third graders were released from Title I Reading. Two other 3<sup>rd</sup> graders were identified for SPED services. 1 of the fourth was released from Title I Reading.

### **Lead21 Reading Placement Assessment**

All the 3<sup>rd</sup> graders and 4<sup>th</sup> graders that attended SAC at the beginning of the year were given the Lead21 Placement Assessment to determine which reading group they would be placed in. The placement assessment was also given at the end of the year to measure growth. All students showed growth on the placement assessment from fall to spring.

### **DRA2 (Developmental Reading Assessment)**

According to the DRA, all Title students were reading below grade level. From Fall to Spring, all but one Title I student made gains

### **Aimsweb**

We used Aimsweb to evaluate the students' oral reading words per minute and accuracy. We also used the Aimsweb MAZE assessment to evaluate comprehension. In third grade, 13 out of the 19 students that entered Title I Reading at the beginning year not only make gains in their words correct per minute on the oral reading, but they also increased their percentile from fall to spring. On the MAZE, 14 out of the 19 third graders increased their number correct and percentile from fall to spring. In fourth grade, 5 out of 9 students entering the Title I Reading program increased their number correct and percentile from fall to spring on both the oral reading and the MAZE.

### **Reading Curriculum Reflections**

We believe that the Lead21 curriculum is preparing our students well. However, we do understand the concern that teachers have at lower grade levels when it comes to the lack of explicit phonics instruction. We have identified skills that are lacking in

Lead21 that we will supplement for next year. We have also identified skills that are taught in Lead21 that we will take out because it is not a part of the grade level standards.

For next year, we plan to implement the Lexia program within our Tier 2 instruction. We will also continue to use the West Virginia Phonics instruction for the students that are both inaccurate and slow. We will use 6-Minute Solutions for the students that are accurate, but slow. We will use fluency passages and miscue analysis for the students that are reading at a good rate, but inaccurate. For students that are reading at a good rate accurately, but struggling with comprehension, they will use Collaborative Strategic Reading.

For Tier 3 students, we will work on making sure that we progress monitor weekly, as opposed to biweekly. These kiddos get instruction from Spalding Writing Road to Read, Explode the Code, sight word and fluency activities from Florida Center for Reading Research, as well as text from Reading A to Z.

### **Title I Parent Involvement Nights**

Title Math and Reading shared a room and cooperated with each other. We worked together to schedule mutual Title students for Tier 3 time.

The first family event was the SAC Title I Parent Teacher Conference Night held on August 18, 2015. We mailed an invitation to all of the students that we determined qualified for Title I Reading or Math based on their previous year's scores. While the students were here for their "Meet the Teacher" night, parents could stop in to sign compacts and ask any questions that they had. Parents were informed about the program. Parents learned how their students would qualify, what our purpose and goals are, how to exit, what instruction would look like, and how progress would be reported. Parents were given a brochure that also addressed the topics that had been discussed. Compacts were signed by parents. Those that did not attend received a letter, the brochure, and a compact in the mail. If we didn't receive anything back after the mailings, we spoke with parents at the October conferences. We tried to make it to every conference for each of our Title I students. After Benchmark screenings were conducted, we also invited other students that demonstrated needs into the Title program.

Another event was "Night at the Museum" and conferences on April 14 and 15, 2015. Students displayed lots of work and projects that they had done throughout the year.

### **Title I Parent and Teacher Surveys**

7 out of the 8 classroom teachers completed the survey. Overall, teachers seem very satisfied with the Title I programs.

Approximately 28 parents received the Title I Parent Survey with their child's March grade card. 7 of the surveys were returned. All but 1 parent was satisfied.