



Title 1 Part A Schoolwide Program Evaluation

Name of School: Rainier Elementary

Date of Current Evaluation: August 1, 2023

Process to Conduct the Evaluation: The administrative team in collaboration with our Title I and LAP teachers/staff meet in the spring and/or prior to the new school year to review and compile data from students, staff, and parents to conduct the annual Title I program evaluation. This evaluation is intended to measure the efficacy and impact of Rainier's Title I, Part A and LAP programs. All aspects of the Title I, Part A program are evaluated, including academic assistance provided, Parent Involvement Activities and effectiveness of related policies. Evaluation data-such as periodic and summative student assessment data and staff and parent/guardian surveys are used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program's impact on raising student achievement and in productively involving parent/guardians in their children's education. The following questions are discussed-

1. Has the Title I, Part a program been effective?
2. What has worked well in the Title I, Part A program?
3. What has not worked well in the Title I, Part A program?
4. How should the Title I, Part a program be refined?

Review of strategies and best practices that impacted student achievement: Rainier Elementary started a new Title I program this year. They used Title I funds to create a 1.0 FTE certificated teacher to run the classroom along with two dedicated paraprofessionals. The desire was to create an environment focused on improving reading fluency and comprehension skills using small group tiered instruction. Being that it is the first year of the program we were curious on what we would find with the data at the end of the year. The staff used Reading Mastery as its curriculum. Embedded assessments were used to track student progress as well as MAP testing which was done at the beginning, middle, and the end of the year. MAP data was used to determine overall growth of the students. Students at each grade level had a 30 minute Title/LAP intervention class every day. This was part of our overall school MTSS system during what we called W.I.N. (What I Need) time. All students were tiered according to their reading levels with their general education teachers. Special Education students would receive their services in their Special Education classrooms.

Evaluate data that supports effectiveness of the program in increasing student achievement for students furthest from achieving state standards.

Data used: MAP testing at the beginning and end of the school year.

Total number of students: 85 total students were placed in the Title/LAP intervention class. 4 students withdrew before end of year data could be collected. So a total of 81 total students were used for data.

- K- 16 students -1 withdrawal = 15
- 1st- 15 students -3 withdrawals = 12
- 2nd- 13 students
- 3rd- 13 students

4th- 12 students

5th- 15 students

Growth: 57 out of 81 students showed growth = 70%

28% showed a year or more growth

42% showed less than a year of growth

23 out of 81 students showed no growth or negative growth = 28%

K= 51% showed growth

1st- 75% showed growth

2nd-77% showed growth

3rd-85% showed growth

4th- 67% showed growth

5th- 73% showed growth

Probable changes to the program based on the evaluation. Staff felt that we needed a better way of compiling data and using that data to move students between groups. Last year there was not a consistent way of checking growth. Different teachers were using various pieces of evidence and nothing was the same. Staff decided that using EasyCBM as a universal form of assessing students in between MAP testing would give consistent results and better data for student movement. Staff decided that using two data points between student movements was better. Each grade level would meet every two months with data to discuss student movement.

Kindergarten and 1st grade student scores showed that we were not effectively meeting their needs. The team decided to try to use Haggerty Phonemic Awareness Curriculum at the K and 1st grade level as part of their program. Hopefully this will give students a stronger foundation for reading.

Last year we did not do a very good job of notifying and explaining to parents what the program entailed and its purpose which led to some withdrawals at various points. This year we are planning on giving more information to parents so the “buy-in” will be greater.

Last year some students with IEP goals were allowed to join the intervention group if their levels were close to that of the group. This took spaces away from general education students who could qualify for intervention based on their scores. This year we are expecting to not allow IEP students into this intervention and they will be served in their Special Education classes.