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Federal Accountability Designation: Focus
Title I Status: Yes
Principal: Angela Pollock
Superintendent: Joseph Padasak

Planning Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Knepper</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionne Martin</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Wentz</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Pollock</td>
<td>Building Principal : School Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanny Nitterhouse</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanny Nitterhouse</td>
<td>Community Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Aurand</td>
<td>Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Campana</td>
<td>Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Helm</td>
<td>Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Ocker</td>
<td>Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Pallavaram</td>
<td>Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim Pawanda</td>
<td>Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Reichelderfer</td>
<td>Instructional Coach/Mentor Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Zook</td>
<td>Instructional Coach/Mentor Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Kanigsberg</td>
<td>Intermediate Unit Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Heaton</td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assurances

Title I Schools

Title I Priority or Focus Schools

All Title I Schools required to complete improvement plans must assure to the Pennsylvania Department of Education the school's compliance with the following expectations by developing and implementing an improvement plan or otherwise taking actions that meet the expectations described by the Assurances listed below.

Assurances 1 through 12

The school has verified the following Assurances:

- **Assurance 1**: This School Improvement Plan contains Action Plans that address each reason why this school failed to make Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and/or is identified in the lowest 10% of Title I schools.

- **Assurance 2**: The resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented have been identified and the necessary approvals obtained to allow the procurement and allocation of these resources.

- **Assurance 3**: Documentation of the resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented; including specific, related budgetary information, is available for review upon request by the LEA or SEA.

- **Assurance 4**: If designated as a Priority or Focus School the district has determined whole-school meaningful interventions directly associated with the unmet AMO(s).

- **Assurance 5**: The school improvement plan covers a two-year period.

- **Assurance 6**: The school has adopted and/or continued policies and practices concerning the school's core academic subjects that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement.

- **Assurance 7**: High performing LEAs with varied demographic conditions have shown they share common characteristics. The following nine characteristics are embedded in the plan:
  - Clear and Shared Focus
  - High Standards and Expectations
  - Effective Leadership
  - High Levels of Collaboration and Communication
- Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Aligned with Standards
- Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning
- Focused Professional Development
- Supportive Learning Environment
- High Levels of Community and Parent Involvement

- **Assurance 8:** Focus Schools must implement locally developed interventions associated with a minimum of one of the below principles, while Priority Schools must implement all seven:
  - Providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership or demonstrating to the State Education Agency that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum and budget.
  - Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; and (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools.
  - Redesign the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration
  - Strengthen the school’s instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with state academic content standards.
  - Use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including providing time for collaboration on the use of data.
  - Establish a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addresses other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students’ social, emotional and health needs.
  - Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement

- **Assurance 9:** The school improvement plan delineates responsibilities fulfilled by the school, the LEA and the SEA serving the school under the plan.

- **Statement 10:** Establish specific annual, measurable targets for continuous and substantial progress by each relevant subgroup, which will ensure all such groups of students, update to align with the new AMOs to close the achievement gap
• **Statement 11**: A mentoring/induction program used with teachers new to the school exists; the essential elements of the mentoring/induction program are documented and the documentation is available for review upon request by LEA or SEA authorities.

• **Statement 12**: All parents with enrolled students will receive an annual notification letter which includes the reasons for its identification as Priority or Focus and the school’s plan to improve student achievement.

**Assurance 13**

The school is communicating with parents regarding school improvement efforts via the following strategies:

- School web site
- School newsletter
- District web page
- Board meeting presentations
- District's annual report
- Press releases to local media
- Yearly letter to parents
- Family Night/ Open House / Back to School Night/ Meet-the-Teachers Night, etc.
- Regular Title 1 meetings

**Assurance for Priority Schools (Annually Updated SIP)**

The school has indicated the following response to indicate if it has completed an evaluation with the assistance of our Academic Recovery Liaison:

Yes

**Title I Schoolwide program**

The school has indicated the following response as to whether or not it intends to run a Title I Schoolwide program:

Yes
A completed Title I Schoolwide program planning addendum is required if the school is running a Title I Schoolwide program.

*No file has been uploaded.*
Needs Assessment

School Accomplishments

Accomplishment #1:
According to PSSA 2012-13 data, our third grade math proficiency rates increased approximately 10 percentage points.

According to PSSA 2013-14 data, our fourth grade math proficiency rates increased 11 points.

In 2013-2014, the proficiency rates in fifth grade math, reading, and writing increased.

From 2013-14 to 2014-15, our grade 3 ELA proficiency rate increased 13 points (29.5 to 42.5).

From 2013-14 to 2014-15, our grade 5 ELA proficiency rate increased 9 points (28.6 to 37.8).

From 2013-14 to 2014-15, our building proficiency rate in ELA increased.

From 2013-14 to 2014-15, our grade 4 Science proficiency rate increased by 5 points and an additional 8 students scored advanced.

Accomplishment #2:
According to Middle of Year MAP Assessments for 2014-2015, 83% of our k-5 students met their mid-year goals (within 3 pts) in math and reading. Ninety percent of first grade students met mid-year MAP projection in math and reading.

According to our 2014-15 EOY MAP data, our students show a lot of growth: Math 50%-83% and Reading 52%-85%

According to Middle of Year MAP Assessments for 2015-16, 88% of our students have shown growth in Reading. We have seen an increase in the percentage of students at the grade level national norm from the BOY MAP assessment to the MOY MAP assessment. (25% to 32%)

Accomplishment #3:
According our Virtual Comparison Group Data (VCG) from NWEA MAP Assessment, our second grade math students scored significantly above their virtual comparison group in 2013-2014. In addition, 2nd grade met the proficiency norm in math.
According to our Virtual Comparison Group Data (VCG) from NWEA MAP Assessment, our first and second grade math students scored significantly above their virtual comparison group in 2014-15. In addition, 1st grade met the proficiency norm, while 2nd grade exceeded the proficiency norm in math.

According to our Virtual Comparison Group Data (VCG) from NWEA MAP Assessment, our second grade reading students scored significantly above their virtual comparison group in 2014-2015. In addition, 2nd grade met the proficiency norm in reading.

The gap in VCG in Kindergarten is narrowing.

Accomplishment #4:  
According to 2012-13, PVASS, Math & Writing in 5th grade demonstrated evidence that the school met or exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In Reading, the Basic and Below Basic categories for 5th grade demonstrated evidence that the school met or exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to 2013-2014, PVAAS Data, we met or exceeded PA Growth standards for students in all performance levels in 4th grade reading, 5th grade math and 5th grade writing.

According to 2014-2015, PVAAS Data, we met or exceeded PA Growth standards for students in 4th grade Math, ELA and Science as well as in 5th grade ELA.

Accomplishment #5:  
According to 2012-13 PVAAS, all academic areas (Reading, Math & Science) in 4th grade demonstrated evidence that the school met or exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to 2013-2014 PVAAS data, 4th grade demonstrated evidence that the school met the Standard for PA Academic Growth in math and reading.

According to 2013-2014 PVAAS data, 5th grade demonstrated evidence that the school met the Standard for PA Academic Growth in math and writing.

Accomplishment #6:  
Attendance is an area of strength with 95% for the 2012-13 school year.

Attendance was 94% for the 2013-14 school year according to SPP breakdown.

Attendance was for the 2014-14 school year.

Accomplishment #7:  
2012-13: PVAAS Growth Measures indicate that we met one year's worth of academic growth in all tested subjects (Reading, Math, Writing & Science).
School Concerns

Concern #1:
According to our School Performance Profile, Proficiency rates in all tested areas are a concern. Although we have seen increases from the previous year in some areas, our proficiency rates are significantly below state averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2014-2015 school year, 93% of our ELL scored Basic or Below Basic in ELA while 100% scored Basic or Below Basic in Math.

Concern #2:
According VCG data for 2013-2014 in Math, Kindergarten scored significantly below their Virtual Comparison groups. The mean gross difference was -7.

According to 2014-15 EOY MAP growth, Kindergarten showed significantly less student growth than all other grade levels.

Even though our Kindergarten VCGs are improving, we still have a deficiency gap with our comparison group.

In addition, our 2014-15 EOY MAP data shows very low normative data ranging from 18% to 59% in math and 28%-54% in ELA.

Concern #3:
Our transient rate is very high. At mid-year we are averaging .8 transfers per day. This equates to 4 transfers per 5 day week. Student population is approximately 275 students.

As of March 18, 2016, we have had 128 enrollments/withdrawals with a total school population of 280. This represents a 46% transient rate.
Concern #4:
According to our 2012-13 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient students did not meet the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to our 2013-14 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient and Basic students did not meet the Standards for PA Academic growth. Our 4th grade Math Advanced students did not meet this either.

According to our 2014-2015 PVAAS, 80% of our 5th grade Math students did not meet the growth standard.

Even though our Quintile 1 students met the growth standard in Math 4, ELA 5, and Science 4, we did not exceed the growth standard in order to narrow the achievement gap.

Concern #5:
Steven's Advanced proficiency rates are low according to PSSA. In 2013-2014, no students scored Advanced on the 5th grade Reading Assessment.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates continue to be low according to PSSA. In 2014-15, there were only 5% of students who were advanced in ELA and 1% in math.

Prioritized Systemic Challenges

Systemic Challenge #1 (Guiding Question #4) Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching

Aligned Concerns:

According to our School Performance Profile, Proficiency rates in all tested areas are a concern. Although we have seen increases from the previous year in some areas, our proficiency rates are significantly below state averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2014-2015 school year, 93% of our ELL scored Basic or Below Basic in ELA while 100% scored Basic or Below Basic in Math.
According to our 2012-13 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient students did not meet the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to our 2013-14 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient and Basic students did not meet the Standards for PA Academic growth. Our 4th grade Math Advanced students did not meet this either.

According to our 2014-2015 PVAAS, 80% of our 5th grade Math students did not meet the growth standard.

Even though our Quintile 1 students met the growth standard in Math 4, ELA 5, and Science 4, we did not exceed the growth standard in order to narrow the achievement gap.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates are low according to PSSA. In 2013-2014, no students scored Advanced on the 5th grade Reading Assessment.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates continue to be low according to PSSA. In 2014-15, there were only 5% of students who were advanced in ELA and 1% in math.

According VCG data for 2013-2014 in Math, Kindergarten scored significantly below their Virtual Comparison groups. The mean gross difference was -7.

According to 2014-15 EOY MAP growth, Kindergarten showed significantly less student growth then all other grade levels.

Even though our Kindergarten VCGs are improving, we still have a deficiency gap with our comparison group.

In addition, our 2014-15 EOY MAP data shows very low normative data ranging from 18% to 59% in math and 28%-54% in ELA.

Our transient rate is very high. At mid-year we are averaging .8 transfers per day. This equates to 4 transfers per 5 day week. Student population is approximately 275 students.

As of March 18, 2016, we have had 128 enrollments/withdrawals with a total school population of 280. This represents a 46% transient rate.

**Systemic Challenge #2 (Guiding Question #5)** Ensure that the organizational structure, processes, materials, equipment, and human and fiscal resources within the school align with the school’s goals for student growth and continuous school improvement.

**Aligned Concerns:**
According to our School Performance Profile, Proficiency rates in all tested areas are a concern. Although we have seen increases from the previous year in some areas, our proficiency rates are significantly below state averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2014-2015 school year, 93% of our ELL scored Basic or Below Basic in ELA while 100% scored Basic or Below Basic in Math.

According to our 2012-13 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient students did not meet the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to our 2013-14 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient and Basic students did not meet the Standards for PA Academic growth. Our 4th grade Math Advanced students did not meet this either.

According to our 2014-2015 PVAAS, 80% of our 5th grade Math students did not meet the growth standard.

Even though our Quintile 1 students met the growth standard in Math 4, ELA 5, and Science 4, we did not exceed the growth standard in order to narrow the achievement gap.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates are low according to PSSA. In 2013-2014, no students scored Advanced on the 5th grade Reading Assessment.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates continue to be low according to PSSA. In 2014-15, there were only 5% of students who were advanced in ELA and 1% in math.

According VCG data for 2013-2014 in Math, Kindergarten scored significantly below their Virtual Comparison groups. The mean gross difference was -7.

According to 2014-15 EOY MAP growth, Kindergarten showed significantly less student growth than all other grade levels.

Even though our Kindergarten VCGs are improving, we still have a deficiency gap with our comparison group.

In addition, our 2014-15 EOY MAP data shows very low normative data ranging from 18% to 59% in math and 28%-54% in ELA.
Our transient rate is very high. At mid-year we are averaging .8 transfers per day. This equates to 4 transfers per 5 day week. Student population is approximately 275 students.

As of March 18, 2016, we have had 128 enrollments/withdrawals with a total school population of 280. This represents a 46% transient rate.

**Systemic Challenge #3 (Guiding Question #2)** Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures school-wide use of data that is focused on school improvement and the academic growth of all students

**Aligned Concerns:**

According to our School Performance Profile, Proficiency rates in all tested areas are a concern. Although we have seen increases from the previous year in some areas, our proficiency rates are significantly below state averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2014-2015 school year, 93% of our ELL scored Basic or Below Basic in ELA while 100% scored Basic or Below Basic in Math.

According to our 2012-13 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient students did not meet the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to our 2013-14 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient and Basic students did not meet the Standards for PA Academic growth. Our 4th grade Math Advanced students did not meet this either.

According to our 2014-2015 PVAAS, 80% of our 5th grade Math students did not meet the growth standard.

Even though our Quintile 1 students met the growth standard in Math 4, ELA 5, and Science 4, we did not exceed the growth standard in order to narrow the achievement gap.
Steven's Advanced proficiency rates are low according to PSSA. In 2013-2014, no students scored Advanced on the 5th grade Reading Assessment.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates continue to be low according to PSSA. In 2014-15, there were only 5% of students who were advanced in ELA and 1% in math.

According VCG data for 2013-2014 in Math, Kindergarten scored significantly below their Virtual Comparison groups. The mean gross difference was -7.

According to 2014-15 EOY MAP growth, Kindergarten showed significantly less student growth than all other grade levels.

Even though our Kindergarten VCGs are improving, we still have a deficiency gap with our comparison group.

In addition, our 2014-15 EOY MAP data shows very low normative data ranging from 18% to 59% in math and 28%-54% in ELA.

Our transient rate is very high. At mid-year we are averaging .8 transfers per day. This equates to 4 transfers per 5 day week. Student population is approximately 275 students.

As of March 18, 2016, we have had 128 enrollments/withdrawals with a total school population of 280. This represents a 46% transient rate.

**Systemic Challenge #4 (Guiding Question #6)** Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures a safe and supportive environment for all students.

**Aligned Concerns:**

According to our School Performance Profile, Proficiency rates in all tested areas are a concern. Although we have seen increases from the previous year in some areas, our proficiency rates are significantly below state averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading:</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science:</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2014-2015 school year, 93% of our ELL scored Basic or Below Basic in ELA while 100% scored Basic or Below Basic in Math.
According to our 2012-13 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient students did not meet the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to our 2013-14 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient and Basic students did not meet the Standards for PA Academic growth. Our 4th grade Math Advanced students did not meet this either.

According to our 2014-2015 PVAAS, 80% of our 5th grade Math students did not meet the growth standard.

Even though our Quintile 1 students met the growth standard in Math 4, ELA 5, and Science 4, we did not exceed the growth standard in order to narrow the achievement gap.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates are low according to PSSA. In 2013-2014, no students scored Advanced on the 5th grade Reading Assessment.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates continue to be low according to PSSA. In 2014-15, there were only 5% of students who were advanced in ELA and 1% in math.

According VCG data for 2013-2014 in Math, Kindergarten scored significantly below their Virtual Comparison groups. The mean gross difference was -7.

According to 2014-15 EOY MAP growth, Kindergarten showed significantly less student growth then all other grade levels.

Even though our Kindergarten VCGs are improving, we still have a deficiency gap with our comparison group.

In addition, our 2014-15 EOY MAP data shows very low normative data ranging from 18% to 59% in math and 28%-54% in ELA.

Our transient rate is very high. At mid-year we are averaging .8 transfers per day. This equates to 4 transfers per 5 day week. Student population is approximately 275 students.

As of March 18, 2016, we have had 128 enrollments/withdrawals with a total school population of 280. This represents a 46% transient rate.

**Systemic Challenge #5 (Guiding Question #3)** Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students.

**Aligned Concerns:**
According to our School Performance Profile, Proficiency rates in all tested areas are a concern. Although we have seen increases from the previous year in some areas, our proficiency rates are significantly below state averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2014-2015 school year, 93% of our ELL scored Basic or Below Basic in ELA while 100% scored Basic or Below Basic in Math.

According to our 2012-13 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient students did not meet the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to our 2013-14 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient and Basic students did not meet the Standards for PA Academic Growth. Our 4th grade Math Advanced students did not meet this either.

According to our 2014-2015 PVAAS, 80% of our 5th grade Math students did not meet the growth standard.

Even though our Quintile 1 students met the growth standard in Math 4, ELA 5, and Science 4, we did not exceed the growth standard in order to narrow the achievement gap.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates are low according to PSSA. In 2013-2014, no students scored Advanced on the 5th grade Reading Assessment.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates continue to be low according to PSSA. In 2014-15, there were only 5% of students who were advanced in ELA and 1% in math.

According VCG data for 2013-2014 in Math, Kindergarten scored significantly below their Virtual Comparison groups. The mean gross difference was -7.

According to 2014-15 EOY MAP growth, Kindergarten showed significantly less student growth then all other grade levels.

Even though our Kindergarten VCGs are improving, we still have a deficiency gap with our comparison group.

In addition, our 2014-15 EOY MAP data shows very low normative data ranging from 18% to 59% in math and 28%-54% in ELA.
Our transient rate is very high. At mid-year we are averaging .8 transfers per day. This equates to 4 transfers per 5 day week. Student population is approximately 275 students. As of March 18, 2016, we have had 128 enrollments/withdrawals with a total school population of 280. This represents a 46% transient rate.

**Systemic Challenge #6 (Guiding Question #1)** Ensure that there is a system in the school and/or district that fully ensures the principal is enabled to serve as a strong instructional leader who, in partnership with the school community (students, staff, parents, community, etc.) leads achievement growth and continuous improvement within the school.

**Aligned Concerns:**

According to our School Performance Profile, Proficiency rates in all tested areas are a concern. Although we have seen increases from the previous year in some areas, our proficiency rates are significantly below state averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2014-2015 school year, 93% of our ELL scored Basic or Below Basic in ELA while 100% scored Basic or Below Basic in Math.

According to our 2012-13 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient students did not meet the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

According to our 2013-14 PVAAS, our 5th grade Reading Proficient and Basic students did not meet the Standards for PA Academic growth. Our 4th grade Math Advanced students did not meet this either.

According to our 2014-2015 PVAAS, 80% of our 5th grade Math students did not meet the growth standard.

Even though our Quintile 1 students met the growth standard in Math 4, ELA 5, and Science 4, we did not exceed the growth standard in order to narrow the achievement gap.
Steven's Advanced proficiency rates are low according to PSSA. In 2013-2014, no students scored Advanced on the 5th grade Reading Assessment.

Steven's Advanced proficiency rates continue to be low according to PSSA. In 2014-15, there were only 5% of students who were advanced in ELA and 1% in math.

According VCG data for 2013-2014 in Math, Kindergarten scored significantly below their Virtual Comparison groups. The mean gross difference was -7.

According to 2014-15 EOY MAP growth, Kindergarten showed significantly less student growth than all other grade levels.

Even though our Kindergarten VCGs are improving, we still have a deficiency gap with our comparison group.

In addition, our 2014-15 EOY MAP data shows very low normative data ranging from 18% to 59% in math and 28%-54% in ELA.

Our transient rate is very high. At mid-year we are averaging .8 transfers per day. This equates to 4 transfers per 5 day week. Student population is approximately 275 students.

As of March 18, 2016, we have had 128 enrollments/withdrawals with a total school population of 280. This represents a 46% transient rate.
School Level Plan

Action Plans

**Goal #1:** Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching

**Indicators of Effectiveness:**
Type: Interim  
Data Source: Measure of Academic Process (MAP)  
Specific Targets: Measure of Academic Process (MAP) Middle and End of year individual goals- MAP BOY projections will designate what a student’s MOY & EOY goals will be. We will utilize comparison reports from NWEA

Type: Interim  
Data Source: Assessment to measure reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension such as Developmental Reading Assessment or Informal Reading Inventory  
Specific Targets: Percent of growth towards District Benchmark will be used for middle and end of the year. Each student's 2014-15 EOY DRA level will guide us in tracking whether there is a year's worth of growth in the MOY and EOY for the 2015-16 school year.

Type: Interim  
Data Source: Success for All Snapshots and District Math Walkthrough form  
Specific Targets: The Snapshot will show at least 80% of teachers with evidence from the established building goal(s)

**Strategies:**

**Best Practices: ELA and Math Professional Development and Implementation of Best Practices**

**Description:**
Professional Development will be created based on the needs of the building. The teachers will receive this professional development though Success for All Foundation, District Math/Literacy Coaches a well as other viable resources. In addition, material and other resources will be made available to support such professional development and best practice implementation.

**SAS Alignment:** Standards, Assessment, Instruction, Materials & Resources
**Implementation Steps:**

**Best Practices: Analyze Math and ELA data to find areas of concern**

**Description:**

The Team will analyze data and pinpoint areas in ELA and Math that will require professional development for the upcoming school year.

Evidence: Core team meeting agenda and sign in sheet

**Start Date:** 3/2/2016  **End Date:** 6/8/2017

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**


**Best Practices: Secure Contracts**

**Description:**

Based on data review, we will secure contracts with Success for All Foundation and possibly other outside supports.

Evidence: signed contracts

**Start Date:** 3/3/2016  **End Date:** 8/11/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:**


**Best Practices: Select Support Dates for Success for All**
Description:

We will communicate with SFAF and district coaches to select and secure dates for implementation.

Evidence: email communication

Start Date: 4/1/2016   End Date: 8/27/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:


Best Practices: Create agendas for visits

Description:

The Reading and Math Supervisors along with district coaches, administrators, and trainers will collaborate throughout the school year to assess our needs and develop agenda accordingly.

Evidence: Agenda

Start Date: 5/1/2016   End Date: 6/30/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:


Best Practices: Learning labs (Instructional Rounds/Peer Visits/Lesson Studies/Book Studies/etc.)

Description:

Learning labs will be embedded into the monthly schedule for teachers to participate in IR, peer visitations, lesson studies, etc.
Evidence: Monthly schedule

**Start Date:** 8/10/2016   **End Date:** 6/30/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:**

**Best Practices: Reflection**

**Description:**

Reflection and feedback sessions

Evidence: Reflection notes

**Start Date:** 8/10/2016   **End Date:** 6/30/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education, Special Education

**Supported Strategies:**

**Best Practices: Greater Coaching Model**

**Description:**

The Coaches will complete goal setting with individual teachers throughout the year using the Greater Coaching Model. Coaches and teachers will meet to assess progress and update or change goals/focus.

Evidence: Coach/teacher reflection

**Start Date:** 8/10/2016   **End Date:** 6/30/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education, Special Education
Supported Strategies:


Best Practices: Resources

Description:

Resources will be purchased as needed throughout the school year to meet implementation of best practices.

Evidence: Purchase orders

Start Date: 7/15/2016   End Date: 6/30/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education

Supported Strategies:


Best Practices: Professional Growth Opportunities for Administrators and Coaches

Description:

As reflection on the building’s progress takes place, there will be a need for additional opportunities for coaches and administration to grow professionally themselves.

Evidence: Agendas, reflection notes, etc.

Start Date: 4/30/2015   End Date: 6/3/2016

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

Goal #2: Ensure that the organizational structure, processes, materials, equipment, and human and fiscal resources within the school align with the school’s goals for student growth and continuous school improvement.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Annual

Data Source: To see the effectiveness of the new Focus School teacher (human resource), we will use the Measure of Academic Progress (fiscal resource).

Specific Targets: Increase in Measure of Academic Progress (MAPS) scores. MAP BOY projections will designate what a student’s MOY & EOY goals will be. We will utilize comparison reports from NWEA.

Strategies:

Focus School teacher: Intensive Research-based Programs through new staff member

Description:

Professional development could be provided for programs such as Level Literacy Intervention, Guided Reading, Children's Literacy Initiative practices, and science & social studies content. In addition, a master schedule will be created to allow for students to receive extra interventions. Students will be selected based on data, observation and teacher input. The Core Team will meet throughout the year to discuss growth and grouping of students.

SAS Alignment: Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, Standards, Assessment

Implementation Steps:

Focus School Teacher: Student assessments

Description:

Students in kindergarten and 1st grade will be assessed at the BOY in reading and writing skills. This will assist with placement. On-going assessment throughout
the year will assist in making the program fluid for students to enter and exit based on their needs for kindergarten. On-going assessment for both grades will drive instructional needs.

Evidence: Assessment data

**Start Date:** 5/27/2016    **End Date:** 9/30/2016

**Program Area(s):** Student Services

**Supported Strategies:**

- Focus School teacher: Intensive Research-based Programs through new staff member

**Focus School teacher: Schedule and hold team meeting to review schedule and select students**

**Description:**

Focus School teacher: The Core Team will meet to select students.

Evidence: schedule and roster

**Start Date:** 3/25/2016    **End Date:** 8/30/2017

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Focus School teacher: Intensive Research-based Programs through new staff member

**Focus School Teacher: Data Meetings**

**Description:**

At the BOY and then after second and third marking period, we will meet as a Core Team to look not only at the Focus School teacher’s data, but all intervention data. All reading programs will remain fluid with students being able to exit and enter based on data.

Evidence: assessment data, rosters, etc.
Start Date: 9/9/2016   End Date: 6/2/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies: None selected

Resources

Description:

Resources will need to be ordered for the Intervention staff member.

Start Date: 4/18/2016   End Date: 6/5/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies: None selected

Focus School teacher: On-going reflection with new teacher

Description:

On-going reflection must be provided between the new teacher and the Core Team regarding data and the progress of the program.

Evidence: agendas, emails, data collection

Start Date: 8/17/2016   End Date: 6/5/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Focus School teacher: Intensive Research-based Programs through new staff member

Focus School teacher: Program review

Description:

A program review will be completed by the Team at the end of each school year to determine the effectiveness and changes needed for the following year.
Evidence: Agenda, notes, follow up emails

Start Date: 6/2/2016   End Date: 6/2/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Focus School teacher: Intensive Research-based Programs through new staff member

Goal #3: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures school-wide use of data that is focused on school improvement and the academic growth of all students

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Interim

Data Source: Measure of Academic Process (MAP)

Specific Targets: Measure of Academic Process (MAP) Middle and End of year individual goals- MAP BOY projections will designate what a student's MOY & EOY goals will be. We will utilize comparison reports from NWEA.

Type: Interim

Data Source: Assessment to measure reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension such as Developmental Reading Assessment or Informal Reading Inventory

Specific Targets: Percent of growth towards District Benchmark will be used for middle and end of the year. Each student's 2014-15 EOY DRA level will guide us in tracking whether there is a year's worth of growth in the MOY and EOY for the 2015-16 school year.

Type: Interim
Data Source: Success for All Snapshots and District Math Walkthrough form

Specific Targets: The Snapshot will show at least 80% of teachers with evidence from the established building goal(s)

**Strategies:**

**Student Goal Setting**

**Description:**

Research shows that student achievement is impacted by students setting and monitoring their own academic goals. Based on our analysis, we will continue student goal setting and recognize student achievement.

**SAS Alignment:** Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources

**Implementation Steps:**

**Student Goal Setting: Documents**

**Description:**

Grade level teachers will determine what form of documentation they will utilize with students to complete goal setting throughout the year.

Evidence: Goal setting sheets

**Start Date:** 8/24/2016   **End Date:** 6/5/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:**

- Student Goal Setting

**Student Goal Setting: Supporting Documents**

**Description:**
The following should be handed into Lit. Coach: Monthly Guided Reading levels for each student, a calendar for when teachers will be seeing groups for the upcoming month and a copy of student goals for the BOY and the MOY.

Evidence: Documents from teachers

**Start Date:** 8/24/2016  **End Date:** 6/3/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:**

- Student Goal Setting

**Student Goal Setting: Preparation**

**Description:**

The Core Team will assist teachers with analyzing student data and prepare for student goal setting sessions as needed.

Evidence: Agenda, data sheets, follow-up communications

**Start Date:** 9/2/2016  **End Date:** 6/5/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:**

- Student Goal Setting

**Student Goal Setting: Meet with Students**

**Description:**

Grade level teachers will meet with their students individually or in small groups to goal set at the beginning of the year and the middle of the year. They will also meet at the end of the year to reflect.

Evidence: goal setting sheets

**Start Date:** 8/24/2016  **End Date:** 6/5/2017
Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Student Goal Setting

Student Goal Setting: Student Recognition

Description:

Students will be recognized for their goal setting successes

Evidence: stickers/teacher documentation

Start Date: 9/2/2016   End Date: 6/5/2017

Program Area(s): Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- Student Goal Setting

Goal #4: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures a safe and supportive environment for all students.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Annual

Data Source: Data will be collected on newcomer ESL students when they arrive.

Specific Targets: Data will continue to be collected for students who are placed in the Newcomer Program. There will be guidelines created that will allow students to transition into classes as well as totally out of the program.

Strategies:

New Intensive ESL Reading Program
Description:

We will create a new Intensive ESL Reading Program. This will include a newcomer classroom (1-5th) that will assist with the successful transition of students who enter the building with no English Language ability. The Newcomer curriculum will focus on listening, reading, writing, and speaking and emphasis content specific vocabulary for language arts, math, science, and social studies. The program will remain fluid allowing students to exit all or part of the program whenever they are ready. Each student’s progress will be monitored with assessments, checklist of basic competencies, and student work to evaluate a student transitioning out of the program into a general classroom with instructional support from ESL as a pull out model. The K-2nd grade ESL time block will increase allowing for students to receive more intense reading and ESL services through best practice strategies as well as possible programming.

SAS Alignment: Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, Safe and Supportive Schools

Implementation Steps:

New Intensive ESL Reading ProgramCreation

Description:

There will be many details of the program that will need to be planned for including but not limited to the following: schedule, entry guidelines, exit guidelines, curriculum, resources, etc.

Evidence: agendas, emails

Start Date: 3/30/2016   End Date: 8/26/2016

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies: None selected

New Intensive ESL Reading Program: On-going Data Collection and Reflection

Description:
The new teacher, ESL supervisor and building administration will need to discuss students’ progress periodically throughout the school year. We will also need to discuss the strength and areas of concern with the actual program.

Evidence: assessment data

**Start Date:** 9/1/2016    **End Date:** 6/2/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:** None selected

**New Intensive ESL Reading Program: Reflection meetings**

**Description:**

Reflection meetings will occur throughout the school year to discuss glows and grows of the new Intensive ESL Reading Program.

Evidence: follow up documents and emails

**Start Date:** 8/26/2016    **End Date:** 6/2/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:** None selected

**New Intensive ESL Reading Program: Resources**

**Description:**

Resources will be needed for the new Intensive ESL Reading Program.

**Start Date:** 4/18/2016    **End Date:** 6/5/2017

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:** None selected
Appendix: Professional Development Implementation
Step Details

No Professional Development Implementation Steps have been identified for Stevens El Sch.
Assurance of Quality and Accountability

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the school level plan for Stevens El Sch in the Chambersburg Area SD has been duly reviewed by a Quality Review Team convened by the Superintendent of Schools and formally approved by the district's Board of Education, per guidelines required by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

We hereby affirm and assure the Secretary of Education that the school level plan:

- Addresses all the required components prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education
- Meets ESEA requirements for Title I schools
- Reflects sound educational practice
- Has a high probability of improving student achievement
- Has sufficient District leadership and support to ensure successful implementation

With this Assurance of Quality & Accountability, we, therefore, request that the Secretary of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education grant formal approval to implement the school level plan submitted by Stevens El Sch in the Chambersburg Area SD for the 2014-2017 school-year.

No signature has been provided

Superintendent/Chief Executive Officer

No signature has been provided

Board President

No signature has been provided

IU Executive Director
Evaluation of School Improvement Plan

Describe the success from the first year plan
After reflection on the first year of implementation, we feel that the student goal sheets were very successful, especially in the intermediate grade levels. Students and teachers were diligent on reflecting on their goals. This will be a continued project for next school year. Another area of success would be seen in teacher collaboration with District Coaches and with our Success for All Coach. We feel strongly that this was a year of building relationships which will lay the foundation for ongoing coaching plans. We began Instructional Rounds this school year, concentrating on a Problem of Practice. Team consisted of our District Coaches, Success for All and our own teachers. The feedback from the teachers involved was excellent. It provided a global look at our building. Our Middle of the year MAP data showed that all grade levels in Reading and math had an increase in the number of students that met or exceeded their middle of the year goal in comparison to last year’s middle of the year MAP data.

Describe the continuing areas of concerns from the first year plan
We will continue to work on implementing best practices with fidelity. This will be accomplished with the assistance of our District Coaches as well as the Success for All Coach. Instructional Rounds, professional development and ongoing coaching plans will all focus on this. Small group instruction, rigor and cooperative learning will be some of the areas that we will concentrate on next school year. In addition, we will be specifically concentrating on kindergarten math due to scores seen at this grade level.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised
Our Focus School Intervention teacher will move grade levels next school year. Instead of a concentration in 4th and 5th grade, we will be moving to 2nd and 3rd grade. We feel this is needed to be successful with the goal of having all students reading by third grade. We will continue to work with Success for All but not the Children’s Literacy Initiative. We began using Instructional Rounds with Success for All and feel that this will be our focus for next school year. The Instructional Rounds will allow us to pin point a "Problem of Practice" such as rescuing verses scaffolding (which will be our first Problem of Practice next school year). Student goal setting will remain the same.

Describe the success from the past year.
We feel that one of the successes from this school year's Focus School plan would be the ensuring best practices are taking place in the building. With the assistance from Success for All, our Coaches have been able to form a very strong team approach to assisting our teachers. The representative from Success for All is a Coach for our Coaches and our teachers. The teachers are now very comfortable with our coaching model and utilize these resources daily. As stated in the February Success for All review, “Teachers are reflecting on data-driven, instructional shifts and sharing success that can be replicated in other
content areas or grade levels.” With this acceptance of the coaching model, "Best practice instruction is continuously improving, increased rigor is observable and a majority of students are on pace to meet the school wide goal."

Describe the continuing areas of concerns from the first two years.
A continual focus on the primary students, particularly kindergarten, is still a cause for concern. Based on the BOY data, kindergarten is entering Stevens at a significantly lower level than at other buildings throughout the District. In addition to Success for All assisting with kindergarten next year, we will also place our Focus School teacher in kindergarten. See below.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.
Our Focus School teacher is currently providing interventions to 2nd and 3rd grade students. We have seen success with this concentration with students growing at a quicker rate who participate in this extra intervention. We will be moving the teacher to work with kindergarten and 1st grade next school year based on our continual concern about the students in the primary.